

LIBRARY
OF THE
UNIVERSITY OF ILLINOIS

OF
RESISTING
THE
Lawfull Magistrate
Under colour of
RELIGION:

AND
Appendant to it, of the word *Kpious*
rendred *Damnation*, Rom. 13.
REPRINTED.

Henry Hammond

ALSO,

{ Of the Zelots among the Jewes.
{ Of taking up the Crosse.
{ A Vindication of Christs reprehending St. Peter,
from the exceptions of Mr. Marshall.

OXFORD,

Printed for *EL. H.* and *W. W.* 1644.

RESISTING

Lawful Magistrate

Under colour of

RELIGION

AND

Any attempt to it of the word also
and therefore you
RESISTANCE

1790

Of the Nobles among the Jews.

Of taking up the Cross
A Vindication of Charles and Elizabeth
from the accusation of M. Joseph

OXFORD

Printed for M. B. and W. N. 1844

Of resisting the lawfull Magistrate upon colour of Religion.

IN this proposall of the point for debate, there are onely two words will need an account to be given of them: 1. What is meant by Resisting. 2. Why the word Colour is put in. For the first, Resisting, here signifies violent, forcible, offensive resistance, fighting against, as *Hesychius* the best Scripture-glossary explains it, (ἀντιπαύειν & ἀντισταμεν all one, and ἀνίσταμαι * ὁ ἀντίς ἐς τὴν μάχην) and the Apostle in like manner, *Rom. 13.* 2. using ἀνιστασθῆναι & ἀντεσθῆναι, promiscuously for the same, and so in other places, although it is true, it is used sometimes in a wider sense; but that will not here be materiall, when we here set down before-hand what we meane by it. For the second, the word [Colour] is in the Title added, onely for this reason, (not to preiudge the Religion, which is fought for, to be onely a colour, but) because it is possible for a man to fight for Religion, and yet not upon colour of Religion; to wit, in case the Religion for which hee fights be established by the Law of the Land, for then his colour for fighting may be the preservation of Law, which the Magistrate is bound by oath to maintain; and though hee fight for Religion, yet it is under that other colour: where-as hee that fights upon colour of Religion, making that his onely pretence of fighting, is *ipso facto* supposed to fight for a Religion distant or contrary to that which is established by Law, and so all pretence or colour of Law excluded, yea, and all supposition of failing in the Magistrate; he standing for the Law present, not against it; which I desire may be the setting of the case, to exclude the fallacy, *plurimum interrogationum*, and to distinguish the quarrell of Religion from that other of Law, and so to meddle at this time onely with that which is fully within the Divines Spheare, and leave the other to some body else.

Those two termes being thus explained, and so the state of the question set, the lawfull Magistrate; and the established Law of the Kingdome on one side; and some person or persons inferiour to him, upon colour of Religion, i.e. for some Religion not yet established by Law, on t'other side, that it should be lawfull to them to take up Armes against him, would seem not very reasonable, if he were but a private man, abstracted from Regall power, (which sure doth not make it more lawfull to resist him then any body else) having broken no established Law, (as is supposed in the case) for what legall accusation can lie against him in a point wherein hee hath not broken the Law? But then this will be more unreasonable, if moreover it be considered, that colour of Religion is so wide and unlimited a thing, that no man, that is never so much in the wrong in

any opinion, but thinks himselfe in the right, (for otherwise he would not continue in that error) and so that colour will be plea equally good to all sorts of errors, as well as truths : and besides, he that hath not so much Religion as to be in an error, may yet have so much wit as to make use of that Apology for his sedition, (to wit, colour of Religion) and plead it as legally as the most zealous professour ; and consequently, if that will serve turne, who ever shall but pretend to beleve contrary to the Religion established in any Kingdome, shall be *ipso facto* absolved from all bond of Allegiance in *foro humano*, and if hee will adventure the hazard of the judgement to come, shall have no restraint laid on him by any earthly Tribunall ; and so by this meanes already, the grounds of the dissolution of any government are laid by this one unpolitick principle, and the world given up to be ruled onely by the Religion (which is in effect, the will) of every man ; whereas before, there was a State as well as a Church, Policy as well as Religion, a power in the Magistrates hand, besides that in every mans owne brest or conscience ; and yet more particularly, a restraint for hypocrites, as well as any else, *i. e.* for pretenders of Religion. who, if this ground would hold, were left unlimited. Where, if it be interposed, that such an one that fallaciously pretends Religion, though by this disguise hee escape here, yet shall surely pay for it hereafter ; and that that is sufficient, because there is no other Court, but of that searcher of hearts, to which the hypocrite can be bound over : I answer, that although that be true, yet it is not sufficient ; because, although there be a judgement to come for all crimes, yet it is notwithstanding thought necessary to have present judicatures also, not to leave all offenders to terrours at such a distance : and indeed, for the continuance of the peace of Communities, to provide some violent restraint at the present for those, whom those greater but future deterrments cannot sufficiently work on. This every man knowes is the originall of humane Lawes, yea, and of Dominion it selfe, a *provision* that all men will not doe their duties for love or feare of God, (it is apparent, the Jewes would not under their *θεοκρατία*) and therefore for good mens sakes, and for peace sake, and for the maintaining of Communities, those superadditions have been thought necessary, as some thornes in the hedge of Gods Law, that may pierce the hands and sides of him that shall attempt to break over or thorough it. From whence the conclusion will be evident, that the Rules for the preserving of government must be such as shall have force to restrain the Atheist or the Hypocrite, as well as the good Christian (which sure will lesse need those restraints) or else they are utterly insufficient to the attaining of their end, *i. e.* to the preserving of government, peace, community, or protecting any that lives under it : Which being supposed, it will also follow, that nothing must be indulged upon any colour of Religion, (be his Religion never so true, and himselfe never so sincere in it ;) which will open this gap or out-let to others, that may make the ill use of it : For this will be utterly destructive of the end of government (which is, that wee may lead a peaceable and quiet life, *1 Tim. 2. 2.*) yea, and of government it selfe.

This argument being thus prosecuted and cleared, might be sufficient to determine this whole business, were it not for one rejoinder which is ordinarily made, the force of which is taken from that supreme care that every man ought to have of his owne soule, and consequently of the maintaining of his Religion, on which (to abstract from all possible disputes concerning the particular truth of it, he being perhaps not acute or artist enough to uphold it against all objecters) he is fully convinc't, the health and salvation of that wholly depends. For the maintaining of which against all the humane power in the World, if he may not take up Armes, or doe any thing, he cannot see what can be fit for him to fight for, (nothing sure being more precious then that;) or consequently, why he may not take up that opinion of the Beyond-Sea-Anabaptists, That it is not lawfull to fight at all: which if it should be yeilded to, although for the present it would produce peace, yet it would be little for the advantage of Magistrates in the issue. To this I shall answer, by concession of these four things:

1. That Religion is to be every mans supreme care, the prime Jewel in his Cabinet. 2. That it cannot, at least in humane consideration, be expected that any man should be lesse carefull of his false Religion (if hee be really perswaded of the truth of it) then any other is of the true. Nay, 3. that if he doe not use any lawfull means to defend that false (whilest he is convinc't it is the true) Religion, this is a sin of lukewarmnesse in him; though indeed through prepossession not to open his eyes to greater light and revelation of the truth offered to him, and perhaps through sluggishnesse not to seek that light, be yet a farre greater sin in him. For though no man ought to defend the contrary to what he takes to be truth, yet ought he to be most ready to deposite his error, not onely when it doth, but also when it may appeare to him to be so, and to seek to those helps that may be instrumentall to that end. 4. That in some cases the use of Armes is not unlawfull. But then all this being thus granted, and so in effect, that all lawfull means may be used for the maintaining of Religion, we must yet secondly deny the inference of the Objection, upon this onely ground, because though Armes may lawfully be used in some cases, and Religion be maintained by all lawfull means; yet Armes are not a lawfull means for this end, and so may not be used in this case; that is, by Subjects against the lawfull Magistrate in case of Religion, at least when some other Religion is by Law established in that Kingdome. Which Assertion I shall confirme onely by foure Arguments: 1. Taken from the nature of Religion. 2. From examples of Christ and Christians. 3. From the very making of Christianity, and particularly of the Protestant Doctrine. 4. From the Constitution of this Kingdome, which being subordinate to the other three, may deserve consideration, as farre as it agrees with them.

1. From the nature of Religion, which is an act of the soule, which cannot be forced or constrained by outward violence; and therefore, 'tis apparent, needs no outward defence for the maintaining of it, much lesse invasion of others. A man may be as truly religious under all the tyranny and slavery in the world.

as in the most triumphant prosperous estate? They that have power to kill the body, are not able to commit the least rape upon the soule; they may rob me of my life, they cannot of my Religion; the weakest creeple in the Hospitall may defie the whole Army of the Philistines in this matter. But you will ask, Is not the outward profession and publike exercise of Religion some part of it, and that to be thus maintained, where any attempt to hinder it? To which I answer, That the first of these, the outward Profession, can no more be hindred then the former act of the soule, but rather may be most illustrious in the time of depression. I may confesse Christ in the den of lyons, in the furnace, on the rack, on the gridiron, and when my tongue is cut out, by patient, constant suffering in that cause. Religion is not so truly professed by endeavouring to kill others, as by being killed patiently our selves rather then we will renounce it. When I fight, it may be malice, revenge, some hope of gaine (or impunity at least) by the present service, any one of a hundred worldly interests, that may help to whet my sword for me; or most clearly, a hope I may kill and not be killed: and so all this while here is, no act of confession of Christ in thus venturing my life, although I doe affirme I doe this for my Religion; because, though I so affirme, men are not bound to believe me, there being so much oddes against me, that I doe it for some what else. But when I lay down my life patiently, the sacrifice of my God, resigne up all possible worldly interests for the retaining of my one spirituall trust, this is to the eye of man a profession capable of no reasonable suspicion of insincerity; and indeed none so, but this.

As for the second, the publike exercise of the true Religion, it were by all meanes heartily to be wisht that it might be enjoyed at all times, for the advancing of Gods glory, increase of charity, conversion of others, &c. But if it may not be had by the use of lawfull meanes, it will not be required of us by God, without whose speciall providence it is not, that hee permitte us to be forbidden that exercise. Till the same providence be pleased to remove such hinderance, and open to us a lawfull way of obtaining it, the primitive Christians secret meetings will first be imitable to us; and if those be obstructed also, their solitudes next. And howeever, that designe of obtaining free exercise of our Religion, will never make any practice lawfull to be used in order to that, that before was utterly unlawfull.

But are we not to take care of our children and posterity, as well as of our selves? If our Religion be now suppress, our poore children and progeny to the end of the world may in all probability be kept in blindness and ignorance, and so left to the place of darkness irrecoverably. This objection sounds somewhat pathetically, and is apt to affect our bowels, more then our reason; moves our compassion first, and thorow those spectacles is then represented with improvement to our judgement. But for answer to it, though the Doctrine of Election of particular men, as well and as absolutely to the meanes as to the end, might be to him that acknowledges it a sufficient amulet against this feare, and so no need of that their zealous care for their posterity, any farther then it is in

their power to contribute toward them (which sure is no more then to doe what is lawfull for them to doe;) yet the answer will be more satisfactory to all that acknowledge Gods providence, however opinionated concerning decrees, that whosoever considers himselfe as a man, much more as a father of a posterity, must have many things to trust God with, and onely God; and among those nothing more, then the future estate of those which are come from him. Yet, if he be importunate and still unsatisfied, unless he himselfe contribute somewhat to the securing of his posterity in this matter, let me tell him, There is nothing (after his prayers to God, and paternall blessing on them) so likely to entaile his Religion upon them, as his sealing it by his sufferings. This sure will be a more probable way to recommend his Religion to them, (when they shall heare, and be assured by that testimony, that their fathers thus hoped in God) then that other so distant, that they died in a rebellion against the King; or, that this Religion had been in their time turned out of the Land, had not they done something so unlawfull to protect it. Besides, the greatest prejudice which that posterity (of which wee pretend such care) can suffer by my non-resistance, is onely to be brought up in a contrary Religion, to heare that way first, but sure not to have their eares deafed against all others when they shall be represented, nor to bring the guilt of non-representation upon them if they be not. And if I bring forth reasonable creatures, I hope they will, by the grace of God, make use of this reason and his grace, to find out that truth that their soules are so much concerned in: and if (through no default personall of theirs) they should misse of it, I hope the invincibleness of their ignorance, and their sincere repentance for all their sinnes and errors knowne and unknowne, and their readinesse to receive the truth, if it were or might be represented to them, would be antidote sufficient, by Gods mercy in Christ, to preserve them from that poison, so they were carefull according to their means of knowledge to escape all other dangers. And all this upon supposition, but not concession, that the Religion of him that would fight for it, were the truth and only truth; whereas indeed, there is not a more suspicious mark of a false Religion, then that it is faine to propagate it selfe by violence: The Turks and Papists being the onely notable examples hitherto of that practice; till some others, directly upon Popish principles a little varied in the application, have falne upon the same conclusion.

Now secondly for the examples of Christ and Christians, but first of Christ: His example (as to this purpose) is evident in three passages (besides that grand transcendent copy proposed from the aggregate of all his life and death, *Mat. 11. 29. Learn of me; for I am meek and lowly.*). The first is, *Luk. 9. 54.* The inhabitants of a Samaritan village would not receive Christ, *vers. 53.* upon that, *Peter* and *John* remembering what *Elias* had done in the like kind, *1 King. 18.* and *3 King.* asked his judgement of it, whether he would be pleased that they should command fire to come down from heaven and consume them, as *Elias* did; that is, in effect, whether they should not doe well to use whatever power

they had (and be confident that God would assist them in it) to the destroying of those who-ever they were (and yet that they were not their Magistrates it is cleare) which affronted them in the exercise of their Religion, or indeed, which would not receive Christ. To this Christ answers sternly, the words are emphaticall, he turned (as to Peter when he gave him that check, *Mat. 16. 23.*) and rebuked them, and said, *Ye know not what manner of spirit you are of:* that is, *Elias* was a Zelot, *1 Mac. 2. 58.* (the full importance of which will belong to another disquisition) & *juro zelotarum*, might doe somewhat against *Baals* Prophets, which will not agree with that distant calling or profession of a Disciple of Christ, or Christian; they are mistaken if they think they may doe as *Elias* did. From whence, by the way, is a prohibition fully legall put in against all examples of the Old Testament, (if any such there were) from being pleadable amongst Christians, upon this ground of *Josephus* his observing, that the Jewes were governed by a *Διοπάνα*, God being as it were their King on earth for a long time, presiding immediately, and interposing by his Oracle, and other particular directions, as well as standing Law, as in that case of *Phinees* and *Elias*, &c. By which those acts of theirs, though authorized by no settled or ordinary Law, were yet as legall as what-ever in any other Common-wealth were done by authority legally descending from the supreme Magistrate. Which whosoever shall now apply to Christians, besides that he professes himselfe an asserter of Enthusiasmes, will meet with Christs check to the Boanerges, *Ye know not what spirit you are of:* I have not authorized you to pretend to the Spirit of *Elias*, or to doe what a Zelot among the Jewes might doe.

The second exemplary passage to this purpose in the story of Christ is, *Mat. 26. 51.* when Christ was apprehended by those tumultuous persons, at the best but servants of the chiefe Priests and Elders (not againe by any power of lawfull Magistrate) Peter drew the sword, and smote off one of those servants ears; upon that, Christs Answer is the thing to be observed, *vers. 52.* Then said Jesus unto him, *Put up again thy sword into his place, for all they that take the sword, shall perish with the sword:* The speech particular to Peter, a prime Disciple or Christian, that he having drawn the sword in defence of Christ, and in him of Christianity it selfe, (a more justifiable course then ever any man since undertook under the colour of Religion) must put it up again; but the reason added, of an unlimited universall obligingnesse to all Christians; *For all they that take the sword* (as Peter did, in defence of Christ, &c. or else the citation had not been pertinent to him) *shall perish by the sword.* And the two parallel places which are noted in the margent of our English Bibles, are somewhat considerable; the first, *Gen. 9. 6.* where that Law was given to the sons of *Noah*, *על דם בשר לא יאכל* concerning the effusion of blood, which sure was not any prohibition to legall, though capitall punishments of Malefactors, (but rather the investing the Magistrate with that power of the sword) and yet is by Christ urged as a prohibition to Saint Peter; signifying, that effusion of blood by him in that case to be utterly illegall, and against the intention of that old Law, not abrogated

abrogated (it seemeth) by Christ. The other parallel place is *Revel. 13. 10.* where immediately upon the repeating of those words, *He that killeth with the sword, shall be killed with the sword,* is subjoynd, *Here is the patience and faith of the Saints. i.e.* Christian Martyrs, *vers. 7.* whose faith it seems and patience must goe together; which sure is most irreconcilable with forcible resistance.*

The third exemplary passage of Christ was in his suffering, wherein many particular circumstances might be observed, especially his answer to *Pilate, John 19. 11.* in acknowledgement of his legall power given him from above. But all that I shall observe is onely in the generall, That hee that had so many legions of Angels, certainly sufficient to defend him and invade his enemies, (whatsoever will be thought of the Christians strength in *Tertullians* time to have done so too, of which more anon) did yet without the least resistance give himselfe up to suffer death. And if it should be objected, that this was to accomplish what God hath decreed (*ought not Christ to suffer these things,* and *thus it is written, and thus it behoved Christ to suffer*) and in obedience to that decree, not as matter of example to us, or of intimation, that it had not been lawfull for him to have done otherwise. To this I answer, That as Christ was decreed to that death, and non-resistance, so are Christians (if Saint *Paul* may be beleevd) predestinated to be conformed to the image of his Son, *Rom. 8.* that is, to that pattern of his in suffering, not fighting for Religion: and that revelation of Gods will in that decree being supposed, it will follow, That though Christ might have lawfully done otherwise, yet wee Christians now may not, especially being commanded to learne of him particularly his meeknesse; *i.e.* especially that Lamb-like quality of the Lamb of God in his sufferings, *Isai. 53. 7.* So much for the examples of Christ.

Now for the like of Christians; it will be needlesse to mention any other then those of whom *Tertullian* and Saint *Cyprian* spake, being so perfectly home to that purpose, *Tertul. in Apol. c. 37.* and his book, *Ad Scapulam*, wholly to this purpose: and Saint *Cyprian* in his book against *Demetrianus*, &c. The summe of which is this, That the Christians of that age had strength sufficient, either to have resisted, or avenged themselves upon their heathen persecuting Governours; but in obedience to the Lawes of Christ, chose rather to die, then doe so. The severall testimonies (of which this is the Abstract) being so fully produced by many, and known by all, it will be more to purpose to vindicate them from all exceptions, and intercept all evasions, which the wit of this last yeare (beyond all that any former age pretended to) hath invented to evacuate those testimonies; witnesse *Goodwins Anticavalierisme*, p. 23. &c. And this I shall take leave to doe at large, because it is said, many have been satisfied in the lawfulness of their present course, by those Answers and Objections which that book hath helpt them to.

1. It is objected, *The father (Tertullian) might easily be mistaken, in making the estimate of the strength of Christians, in comparison of the strength of them that were to oppose them.* This is in civill termes, to say, *Tertullian* wrote hee

* The force of this place of Christ to St. Peter, see M. M. hath labour'd to delude, and therefore have labour'd to vindicate in another Discourse hereto appendant, which I referre the Reader.

knew not what ; or at the softest, Hee might be ignorant of what he affirmeth he knew ; and I am confident, was more likely to know, living then, then the Objecter now, seeing or conjecturing at the distance of so many hundred years ; who hath not the least authority (which must be the Judge in matter of fact) on his side, against so distinct and cleare affirmation, not onely of *Tertullian* in severall places (and that in an Apologie against the Gentiles, who could and would certainly have tript him in so manifest a fallhood, if it had been such ; and though the negative Argument be not fully convincing, that they did not thus trip him, because we doe not heare or read they did, yet will this be of as much force as any he hath to the contrary : This certainly, the writing it to the Gentiles, will be able to conclude, that *Tertullian* had been very imprudent and treacherous to his owne cause, to have affirmed a thing in defence of it, which his adversaries could so manifestly have proved a falsity, if it were not so as hee affirmed) but of *Cyprian* also, who lived about the same time ; and no Writer of that age or since produced (I doubt not but I may say, producible) to the contrary.

Of the proofes that are offered to make it appeare possible and probable, that *Tertullian* should be so mistaken, the first is, *Because this was no point of faith, &c. and therefore a devout father might fall under a misprision herein.* I grant he might, but that doth not prove he did ; no nor that it is probable he should be a more incompetent judge in such a matter, then hee that now undertakes to controll him : Nay sure, lesse reason is there to deny the authority of the Ancients in matters of fact (which if they were not evident to them, must needs be much lesse evident to us, who have no means to know any thing of them but their relations, nor cause to suspect such relations, but either by some impossibility in the things themselves, which is not here pretended, or by some other as authentick relation contradicting it, which is as little pretended) then of faith, the ground of which being onely the written word of God, is common with them to us ; and therefore may enable us to judge, whether that which they affirme to be matter of faith, be so indeed, to be found really in that sacred Writ, from whence they pretend to fetch it.

And whereas it is farther added, *That no rule of charity or reason binds us to beleve another, in any thing which belongs to the art or profession of another, and wherein himselfe is little versed or exercised :* I answer, that this saying, thus applied, will take away the authority of a very great part of those Histories which no body yet hath questioned. If it were spoken of Doctrines, it might hold, and sure to that belongs the axiome quoted, *Unicuique in arte sua credendum est ;* but in narrations it is the unreasonablest thing in the world, to require the Narrator to be of that profession of which hee relates the fact ; for then no man must adventure to write a Kings life but a King : and if Mr. M. Mr. A. or Mr. S. being Ministers of the word, shall write their letters concerning the Parliaments victory at *Keinton*, and relate the number of the slaine on that side, so farre inferiour to those on the Kings, we must now upon this ad-

monition.

monition retract that believe we then allowed them, and begin now (though too late) to question whether it were indeed a victory or no, which caused such solemn thanksgiving in this City. But then secondly, why this Relation should go wholly *belong to the profession of another*, i.e. not to *Tertullians*, I cannot yet discern; For the maine of *Tertullian's* testimony was, That the Christians chose rather to suffer then to resist, though they were able; because Christian Religion taught the one, and forbad the other: And this sure was not without the sphere of the Divine. But for their strength to resist, depending on the number of Christians, not as even ballancing the Heathens in the Empire, but as very considerable, and able to raise an Army, if they would make head, I doubt not but *Tertullian*, a Presbyter, that now laboured in converting and confirming Christians, and was not alwayes in his study, nay, who had lately been a Lawyer, and so not unacquainted with the Publike, might know and relate with farre better authority, then any who hath dared now to contradict him. For, for the art of *ballancing the power of parties in a Kingdome, and grounds of precise determination of such differences*, (which as the Objecter denies *Tertullian*, so he is unwilling to yeeld to the States-man himselve) you shall see anon that we have no need to make *Tertullian* Master of it, his relation will stand unmoved without it.

The second prooffe to blast *Tertullians* Relation, is the ordinary one in fashion now-a-dayes; if any man differs in opinion from us, presently to examine his whole life, and if ever hee did or spake any thing unjustifiable, lay that vehemently to his charge, and by that defame him, and then we may spare the pains of answering his reasons, disproving his assertion; he once lyed or sinned, and therefore it is ridiculous to expect any truth from him. The Argument is this, He might *mistake and miscarry* in this, for *not long after he miscarried so grievously, as to turne Montanist, who called himselfe the Holy Ghost, &c.* Just as if I should resolve to beleieve no relation of any Minister (present in either of the Armies) of the strength of that Army, untill I had examined, and were assured that hee were not a *Chilias*t, an *Arrian*, nor guilty of any others Heresie condemned by the Church: Yea and more, till I had some degree of assurance that hee would never be such. Or, as if I should resolve this man knew no Logick, because in this period he offends so much against Grammar in these words, [to turn *Montanist*, who called himselfe the Holy Ghost;] where the Relative [who] hath certainly no Antecedent; *Tertullian* cannot, for hee called nor himselfe the Holy Ghost, but onely used that stile so ordinary now-a-dayes [nos *spirituales*,] and all others [*animales psychici*;] and *Montanist* cannot, unlesse as once *Areopagi* signified the *Areopagites*, so now by way of compensation, *Montanist* must passe for *Montanus*; for he it was that called himselfe the Holy Ghost, not all or any of his followers. This way of concluding, from a slip in Grammar, an ignorance in Logick, (especially being backt with the suffrage of so many unconcluding Arguments) will be as faire Logically proceeding, as to inferre, because *Tertullian* afterward turned *Montanist*, therefore

then he spake hee knew not what. But then Saint *Cyprian* was no *Montanist*, and yet he affirmed the same that *Tertullian* doth, *contra Demetrian*: As for the approving of *dreames and furious phantasies for true propheties*, (which is added to be revenged on *Tertullian*, for contradicting this Objecter) I confesse I excuse not him, but with we might learne any thing of him, rather then that. But I hope the narration we have now in hand, was neither *Maximilla's* nor *Prisca's dreames*: If it was a *phantase*, it was quite contrary to a *furious* one. And for the close of this Argument, wherein the warning is given as it were from heaven, how unsafe and dangerous it is to build on the authority of men, as I desire the Reader may take it home with him, and from thence resolve to beleeve no longer any thing upon this Objecters authority, so denudate of all reason; so I doe not yet see, why hee that once erred, must never be allowed to speak truth; the making of true narrations being compatible with the greatest heresie in the world.

The third Argument against *Tertullian's* testimony, is an observation of *deiva*, that there is a pronesse of inclination in much devotion, in persons devoutly given, to over-value the workes and piety of other men. To which my onely Answer shall be, That yet I hope it is not observed, that devout men are so strongly inclined to tell plaine lies, to this end, that they may make themselves over-valued by others. This must be *Tertullian's* infirmity, (if the Objecter guesse aright) being a Christian himselfe, and in his Apologie labouring to raise an high opinion of Christians in the Gentiles, to whom hee writes; to which purpose, if he should forge falsities, I must confesse it were a shrewd weaknesse, very ill becoming devotion, whatever the practice of later times may say in excuse of it.

The fourth prooffe is from a second observation, That in the pious and orthodox Fathers themselves, there are some touches and streins, some fibres of the root of bitterness, which afterwards grew rank in the times of Popery, &c. The Answer. All that I can collect from hence toward the conclusion designed, is, that this Objecters sense is, that for *Tertullian* to say there were Christians enough in the Roman Empire to work revenge on their oppressors, was a spice of Popery; and so there is one new piece of Popery more added, to the many which this Age hath concluded under that title, above the inventory of the *Trent* Catechisme. And so now to debate this any further, or profess my selfe to opine as *Tertullian* did, is to acknowledge my selfe Popish, and that is as bad as Prelaticall; and so from henceforth all my Arguments will but passe for temptations, which none but carnall men must submit to, be they never so demonstrative. Yet must I have leave to wonder, how in the close of this Section these words [*the sounder and more considerate knowledge of these latter times*] can have any reference to the point in hand: For certainly, for the strength of the then Christian party, our knowledge in these latter times cannot be sounder or more considerate, then theirs that then lived amongst them: or if it be, the words [*latter times*] will be improper, for sure it will be affirmed onely of that time wherein

wherein Mr. J. G. wrote this part of this book; for I am confident he was the first that ever revealed this act of more considerate knowledge to the world.

The fifth and last proof is, That *what ever their number was, yet it is no wayes likely they should be suffered to have any Armes, &c.* To which, and to all the prudentiall state motives whereon it is grounded, (and so to all that Section) I shall return no answer but the very words of *Tertullian*, which if all put together, they doe not defend their Author from all their assaults, neither will I believe the Christians strength was sufficient to buckle with their adversaries. His words are plain: first, if we would *hostes exertos agere*, deale like profest enemies, *desisset nobis vis numerorum & copiarum*? should we have wanted force of numbers (*i.e.* men) or armed souldiers? (for so sure *copie* signifies.) Secondly, he saith as plainly, *Castella vestra, castra implevimus*, we have filled your Castles and Camps, (there, sure they were armed; and so the Thebean Legion, which yeelded themselves to the Emperours butchery, wanted neither number nor armes to have resisted.) Thirdly, he saith, *cui bello non idonei*? what war had we not been fit for? *etiam impares copiis*, though we had not had so many armed men as they, *qui tam libenter trucidamur*. Their despising of death, (nay, gladnesse to dye) might have put them upon any hazard unarmed; and hee professes the onely thing that kept them from resisting, was the Doctrine which they had learnt, That it was more lawfull to be kil'd, then to kill. Fourthly, hee saith, They had a way of revenge without Arms, to wit, by departing from them, by that secession to have brought envie upon them; (as for example, upon dislike of the present state, to have gone to New-England, &c. to raise an odium upon the Old) but this they would not be so malicious as to doe neither: nay, besides, *amissio tot civium ipsa destitutions punisset*; the losse of so many Citizens would have been a punishment, by making them lesse able to resist other enemies; *plures hostes, quam cives usque remansissent*, there would have been a greater number of enemies, then there would have been Citizens remaining. Fifthly, to put all beyond exception, he puts them in mind how one night with a few fire-brands they might have wrought their revenge, if it were lawfull for them to repay evill with evill. This one last particular being considered, is so full a demonstration of the truth now in debate, that supposing there were but one Christian at liberty to use that one fire-brand, there can be no longer doubt but that there was sufficient strength to work their revenge, if their Religion would have permitted them to doe so. And if their Religion (as was said out of him) were the onely restraint, then certainly their weaknesse was not. Nay, though they should after all this (by a morally impossible supposition) be supposed weak, yet if their Religion did truly restrain them, as he professes it did, this were abundantly sufficient to decide the controversie betwixt us and the Objecter.

Having proceeded thus farre in answer to the severall exceptions against the truth of *Tertullian's* assertion, concerning the strength of those Christians, I am invited farther by a second proffer of the Objecter to make appeare, that although *Tertullian's* assertion should be supposed true, yet it were insufficient;

it would not reach the question, or case in hand. This certainly is strange at first sight, the case in hand being, Whether the reason of their non-resistance were their want of strength. Which in all reason must be determined negatively, when once these two things are supposed; first, that they had strength; secondly, that the command of Christ, or making of Christianity was the cause of their non-resistance, and not want of strength. But there is no truth so evident, but the cunning of such a crafts-master will be able to transforme, both from evidence and truth; and therefore (though in all justice a man might vow never to have commerce with such a man more, that should undertake thus to master his understanding, that he should beleeve and not beleeve the same thing; yeeld the want of strength to be the cause, at the very time when hee acknowledges or supposes, first, no want of strength; secondly, somewhat else, to wit, the command of Christ, to be the cause;) yet I shall (to exercise that Christian meekness, which I desire to assert by my actions, as well as words) wait on this great Artificer to the second part of his Answer. The summe of which, as hee first sets it, is this, *That supposing the father spake truth concerning their strength, yet on some considerations he mentions, It had been in those that were called to suffer, both want of wisdom in respect of themselves, and of charity in respect of others; if they should have made the least resistance.* To which my onely answer shall be, to beseech him to consider, that this is part of *Tertullian's* testimony, that the thing that restrained them was (not this wisdom, but) the doctrine of their Christ; concluding it more lawfull to be kil'd, then to kill; and utterly unlawfull to repay evill for evill. And as for *charity to others*, I humbly wish that were, or may yet be considered, *how much burden, &c.* this resistance (of which he is the protest abetter) hath brought on others, who are no parties on either side; nor, I hope, all Christians, if their onely punishable crime be, making conscience of non-resistance.

To the next Section, in answer to a supposed Reply, where he saith, *That it is not probable they had any sufficiency of strength.* I answer, that I cannot be so tame as thus to be caught, or so wild as to imagine that improbable, at a time when *Tertullian's* testimony is supposed to be true, (as now it is supposed) the speciall part of which testimony is yeelded to be, that they had sufficient strength. And where he adds 2. that 'twas not necessary they should be of one mind and judgement touching this sufficiency, &c. I answer, that wee doe not assert any such necessity, nor doth our cause any way incline us to it, or want that refuge; For sure we affirme not, that they did actually resist (to which onely, that concurrence would have been necessary) but onely that they would not, though they were able; and to the evidencing of that, the concurrence of judgement you speak of, is not materiall; for if they that did so think of their strength, were upon grounds of Christian patience and obedience, as farre from doing or attempting it as any other, these men would certainly have continued in the same obedience, though all the world had concurred with them in the opinion of their sufficiency. For, to professe Christian meekness first, and then upon any
super-

supervient occurrence to be ready for resistance, though it might be a character of the temporary (that I say not hypocritical) subjection of our dayes, yet must not wee be so groundlesly uncharitable, as to affix it on those Christians: and though the Objecter should renounce his present supposition, and again contend, that *Tertullian* lied, and so divest him of all authority as a father, of common honesty as a relater; yet sure he will not be so severe to deny him so much of an ordinary *Rhetor*, as to make that an ingredient in his Apologie for Christians, which were the highest piece of an accusation. Grant but *Tertullian* to have any skill in any of his professions; suppose him but an Oratour, if not a Divine, a tolerable pleader, if not a tolerable man; allow him but skill at the Deske, (his first trade, before he was a Christian) the reputation of a little eloquence, though no sincerity, and his very pleadings will be argumentative, though his words may not.

But 'tis added in the third place, *That having no invitation, countenance, or command from any authority, &c. their case was differing from ours.* To which I answer againe, 1. That it was not still the want of such command or invitation, that restrained them, but the contrary command of Christ; as hath been cleare. But then secondly, I pray let me ask a question, as of one which I will in reason suppose not to be unacquainted with the sense of *Junius*, *Brunus*, and *Buchanan*, and it is only this, Whether, if all temporall Magistrates neglect the worke of Reformation, the Ministers may not and ought not to attempt it, if they can hope to prevail? If so, then though the case be not just the same now and then, yet the difference is not materiall or pertinent; for then sure Ministers there would have been to invite, if that had been the Christian way.

But when it is added within three lines, that we are *invited, &c. by as great and as lawfull an authority as this State hath any*: I must confesse, I had thought that the King and both Houses had been a greater authority, unless the meaning be not simply, but *ad hoc*, as great and as lawfull an authority as this State hath any, to doe what is now done; and then sure it shall be granted by me, who profess my selfe to suppose it impossible, that any command given to this purpose should be lawfull, or able to secure any from that sentence of Saint *Paul's*, *They that resist shall receive to themselves damnation.* Yet once more, It is possible that the Authour, by *this State* may mean a Republique, which though it be a word of some signification in some other Countries, yet that our Lawes acknowledge any such here, I have not yet been taught; nor sure can any part of this Kingdome without the King be capable of this Title, till we have moulded a new forme of Government, and new Lawes, as the Modell of that; for undoubtedly the old ones are not acquainted with any such. But that I will hope is not the meaning, because it is added, that *inferiour Magistrates, &c.* which seemeth to acknowledge, that the Parliament without the King are but inferiour Magistrates. Of the agreeableness of that Title of *Magistrates and Rulers*, to that body without the head, I purpose not to speake; only to that which is added, *That they should be obeyed, as well as Kings.* I answer, (with-

out canvassing of the place in Saint *Peter*, which others have done) That if they are *to be obeyed*; but *as well as Kings*, then 1. The King that commands not to doe it, is to be obeyed, as well as they. 2. Not they against the King, for that the inferiority implies. An inferior Magistrate, in that that is lawfull, and within his Commission, and not thwarted by a superiour, is to be obeyed as well as if he were superiour in that, or as well as the superiour in any thing else; but sure not to the despising of the superiours lawfull commands, when they doe interpose; for that were more then *as well*. When the King commands that which God and the Law doth not forbid, it may be said, that his commands are to be obeyed as well as Gods; which the Apostle intimates, when he saith, *You must be subject for conscience sake*; and the ground of this truth is, because indeed God the supreme, commands that subjection to the King in such matters. But sure for all this the King is not to be obeyed against God, or where any countermand of his hath intervened; for this were, in Saint *Peter's* phrase, *to obey men* (not as well, but) rather then God. Thus is it in that other case, the inferior is to be obeyed, *as well as the superiour*; (in things lawfull, and not contradictory to the Superiours commands) upon that ground of necessity of obedience to the Superiour, from whom he hath his Commission, and as Saint *Peter* saith, *ὁ κύριός σου, is sent of him*; i.e. of, or by that υπέρχων, supereminent person, the King; but sure this holds not against the superiour, as in the other case it did not. 3. Not they, when they command to take up Armes against him whom Saint *Paul* bids me not resist, upon pain of damnation; and by my oath of Allegiance (if it were otherwise lawfull) I have bound my selfe that I will not. Whereupon it is observable, that the Assertors of this warre are now brought to undertake, that damnation, or *ῥήμα*, Rom. 13. shall not signifie damnation, (poor men, what a weak threed doth the sword hang in, that is just over their soules? and what a sad condition would it be, if to one that dyes a confident Martyr in this warre, damnation at the day of doome should prove to signifie damnation?) but some temporary mulct; and yet withall, that this warre is not against the King; (when yet that other against the Earle of *Essex* his Army, is not doubted to be against the Parliament;) which two so strange, and yet distant holds, (for if it be not against the King, what need of that other evasion from the damnation that belongs to resisters? or if resisters shall carry it away so easily, why may not Warre be avowed against the King, by any that will adventure his wrath?) doe sure signifie mens consciences to be strangely grounded, and themselves very groundlessly confident, which are satisfied upon no better principles, and whose practices are capable of no better security.

Upon these grounds thus laid, of obedience due to inferior as well as superiour (supreme it should be, for so υπέρχων must here signifie, and I hope that our King amongst us is such) Magistrates, the Objecter puts a case, that the inferior Governour requires that which is only honest, &c. as to doe our best to defend our selves against those that contrary to law and conscience assault us, the superiour that which is contrary to both, viz. to sit still, &c. In this case hee resolves

resolves it is most cleare on his side, for (whether the lawfulness or necessity he intimates not of) *resistance against the superiour*. To this I answer, that it is hard to beleve that the Objecter did not purposely intend to deceive his Reader by that phrase [*onely honest, &c.*] for that is a very doubtfull sense; it may signifie, that nothing else were honest, and then it is in that sense apparently false; for if it were honest to take up Armes against a King, yet sure may not taking-up Armes be honest too; for (whatever that crime of neutrality signifie in these dayes) it may be lawfull for a man to suffer injury, to suffer himselfe to be defrauded (and that by a King, as well as by an equall) 1 Cor. 6. 7. I hope resistance, though it have lately commenced, and taken upon it the degree of vertue, yet hath not turned Projector, got the monopoly of vertue and honesty into its hand, that it should engrosse and enclose that title, and there be no other vertue or honesty besides this: yet would the affirmations of some, out of no meaner place then the Pulpit, [that all that are for the King at this time are Atheists or Papists] conclude and perswade thus much. But I would fain beleve, that the meaning of the phrase [*onely honest, &c.*] is, [no more then honest] *i.e.* not necessary. But if that be it, then sure the superiour Governour may deserve to be obeyed in forbidding it, as well as the inferiour in commanding: For it will not follow in that case, that the King commands somewhat contrary to the Law of God, and nature; but onely somewhat contrary to something which was agreeable, *i.e.* not against the Law of God and nature; *i.e.* prohibits a thing lawfull, not necessary; as the other is supposed to command a thing lawfull, not necessary: which sure were as free for him to doe, as for the inferiour; supposing, as the Objecter supposes, that the command of God indifferently extends it for obedience to either, in things that are lawfull. Hence it appears, that in the case here put, the command of the superiour is falsly affirmed, to be an unlawfull command; (for then the matter of the inferiours command must be supposed, not *onely honest*, but necessary) and if it be a lawfull one, it may and will then make void that obligation for that particular, which is supposed by the Law of God to lie on us, to obey the inferiour in that which is lawfull. The short is, if that which is here spoken of, be in it selfe necessary, we must doe it, as in spite of all countermands of the superiour, so without all commands or invitations of the inferiour Magistrate; but if it be not necessary in it selfe, neither will the commands of an inferiour make it necessary to any who stands prohibited by a superiour.

In the fourth Section the Objecter offers at a reason, why those ancient Christians (supposing strength in them) should rather patiently suffer, because before their conversion they had consented to the Emperours power, whereby those Edicts were made for the murdering of Christians, &c. To which I answer, that it is ridiculous to seek out, or impose upon the Reader probable or possible reasons for their non-resistance, when Tertullian in their name specifies the true only reason, the Gospel Doctrine of Christian patience and obedience. But for the particular of their consent, much might be added, to shew the vanity of

that plea, if that were *tanti*, or pertinent. I shall only say, that if the Emperour legally murdered Christians, then their consent to that Law (or to the power of the Emperour who made it) would not bind or dispense with them to omit any thing necessary, or otherwise commanded by any greater power; for if I swear to doe so, I must break my oath, *non obstante* what is concluded from *Psalm*. 15. 4. And if it were not other wise necessary, or commanded by greater power then, neither is resistance now. And then, the Kings prohibition will as much restrain me in any thing not necessary, as their heathenish consent could be supposed to restrain them then. Nay, he that makes that *consent a nullity*, (as this Objecter in fine doth) what reason can hee render, why he that gave that consent, might not plead that nullity, for such (though carnall) advantages as life is, if he could make good his pleading, and no other restraint lie on him, but onely that null-consent?

For the fifth Section: How that may be lawfull [for an entire body to doe, which may not be lawfull for a part,] and so for us now, though not for them. I answer, That if the phrase [entire body] signifie the head and members too, then the period is true; if not, then the whole Section is fallacious: for it followes not, that though the representative body without the head is more then a party in the Empire, without the representation of the rest, therefore the first may resist forcibly, though the second should not; for he that from *Saint Paul* denies resistance of Subjects indefinitely to Kings, will not be moved from that hold, by discerning some other slight differences between Subjects, unless they may appeare such that on one side they may authorize resistance. But then secondly, If the Doctrine of Christian patience, &c. were the cause of Non-resistance, then sure was not this other consideration wherein they differ from us, the cause of it.

Well, having gone thus farre, in attendance on this Objecter, and to exercise that patience, which we so much desire to perswade; there is yet the greatest Fort. behind unvanquished, erected in the sixth Section, and rescued from all supposed assailants in six particulars following, set up like so many fortresses about it: The summe of it is (for I would not be bound to recite what every one may read in a printed Book) that if *those Primitive Christians had strength, and might lawfully have resisted*, (by the way, *Tertullian* onely affirms the first, and is so farre from supposing, that hee absolutely denies the second) yet might God hide this liberty from them; and so his after dispensations did require that he should hide it from them, and yet manifest it to us: and these dispensations he specifies to be Gods counsell of Antichrists coming into the world then, and of his being destroyed and cast out now. The hiding of this truth, of Subjects power and right to resist their Superiours, being necessary to help Antichrist up to his throne. And the commonalty of Christians doing contrary to the will of their Superiours, being the men that must have the principall hand in executing Gods judgements upon the Whore, *Revel*. 18. 4; 5, 6, & 9. that is, in the pulling him down.

To this whole discourse (the first I am confident that ever was written on this Subject) I must answer by degrees, (that I may not omit any thing that is added for prooffe or explication by the Authour) and first, I must desire the word *may or might* [may hide] may be changed into plaine intelligible sense. Say, did God hide the liberty of resistance from those Primitive Christians, or no? If he did not, then away with this whole Section, and particularly that affirmation, Pag. 30. that Gods dispensations did require that it should be hid from them. But if God did indeed hide it, then first, this is more then a supposition; it is a plaine concession, that those Christians *Tertullian* speaks of, might not lawfully have resisted, though they had had strength (which was so long denied); for the light being hidden, they must have done it without faith, or against conscience; yea, and against Gods determinate counsell; who, (the Objecter saith) had great causes to hide it; of which one sure must be, that it should not be used. 2. Here is a great secret of new Divinity, that God hides truths (not as Christ spake in parables, because they seeing see not, *Mat. 13. 13.* but) on purpose to help Antichrist to his throne; (of which more anon.) As for that instance of those *that eat herbs*, I pray consider, whether that be pertinent to prove that God purposely hides truths from us, or particularly this truth in hand: For sure that liberty God hid from none in the Apostles time; for the preaching of the Gospel manifested the lawfulness of meats, as well as herbs; onely some saw not, or considered not that that was manifested; and thinking some old legall obligation (as others did circumcision) to lie still on them, submitted to it out of piety. Now apply this to the point in hand. Certainly, the liberty of forcible resistance against Superiours (though it should be granted) would never be found of this kind, a liberty brought into the world by Christ, which before had not been there. If hee shall affirme it was, (as hee must, if that instance of eating be pertinent) though by the concession of the latter part, hee must disclaime all his former Old-Testament pleas for resistance, from the people about *Jonathan*, from *David*, and from *Elisha*; yet will hee never give any probable appearance for the affirmation in the first part, that Christ gave any such new before-unrevealed liberty: but rather, if any such liberty before there were, it was undoubtedly taken away by Christ, from whose example and precepts it was that those Primitive Christians, and we also, dare not make use of that supposed liberty. The onely thing I can imagine possible to be replied, is, That though the comparison hold not exactly, yet it may hold in this, that as that liberty of eating was hid to some, (it matters not by whom, or how) so this of resisting to others. To which I returne, that then it is confessed, that this instance doth onely illustrate the Objecter's meaning; but not so much as probably confirme his assertion: and then I am sorry I have considered it so long. And therefore to bring the point to an issue, I must thirdly aske, Where this liberty, or the authority for this liberty was, when it was thus hid? Was it in the Old Testament? Though it should be there, as it is not, yet it might be taken away in the New, (as those things which in the Old

Testament, or the law of nature, are nearest to giving of that liberty, are absolutely reformed by Christs doctrine and practice) and then that were good for nothing. Was it in the New? Then deale plainly, shew the place in the New Testament which gives that liberty, and is now found out by posterity, though hidden to them. Sure we have found out no new Scripture, to them unknown, (the Nazarites Gospel, though it rehearse some speeches of Christ not in our Canon, yet is not produced for any of this nature: that famous one which it fathers on our Saviour, *Nunquam latē sitis nisi cum fratrem in charitate videritis*, is of another stamp; I would to God this Apocryphall Precept might be Canonically among us) and for any place of the known Canon mis-understood by them, and now clearly unclouded and revealed to us in a right understanding, which inforces this, I must be so charitable to the Objecter, as to think that if hee had discerned any such, hee would not have failed to have shewed it us, (as well as his interpretations of *Rom. 13.* and *Revel. 17. 17.*) if it were but to leave us unexcusable for not being his Profelytes. Beyond these severall wayes of revelation, if posterity have had any other, (or indeed any but that, of understanding of Scripture by Scripture light, or assistance of Gods Spirit, which was not before understood) from whence to fetch a liberty which is not in the Old Bible, or is denied in the New, this is it which wee desire so to warne men of, under the name of Enthusiasme, which is hardly ever distinguishable from a demure frenzie, and I must call it now, the dreame of the dreamers, *Jud. 8.* that despise dominion, speak evill of dignities, but farre from divine revelation. And yet that this is the thing that this Objecter hath an eye to, (and not the understanding of Scripture more clearly then before) may appeare, in that hee affirms this truth *hid from their teachers*, (though *not from all without exception*) who yet if it were hid in the Scripture, were of all others most unlikely not to find it. As for that offer of prooffe, that this truth might lie hid, because there was *no occasion of studying it*: I answer, that in *Tertullian's* dayes, when there was occasion to study it, (as great as ever can arise any, because the persecutions then were as heavey persecutions) we may by that argument think they would have searcht into it, at least the light then would not in ordinary account have proved more dim, as hee saith it did, if the Scripture were the candlestick where this light was held out. That which he adds in the next place, *of the spirit of courage, patience, and constancy, which was by God poured out on the Church in those dayes, and so made martyrdome seeme a desirable thing to them*, is more like a reason indeed of their not-inquiring into this liberty: and herein, I must acknowledge the ingenuity of the Objecter, or the power of truth which extorted this reason from him, so little to the advantage of his cause, and so much of ours: For this is certainly the bottom of the businesse, the want of Christian courage, patience, &c. (for that kind of courage is not in fighting, but suffering) hath helpt us of this last age to that [dreame, not] revelation of liberty, which was never heard of among the ancients. But by the way, it seemes by the Objecter, that now martyrdome is no desirable thing,

thing, nor taking up Christs crosse, nor following of him. Wee are resolved to have no more to doe with martyrdome, think that the thousand yeares for the Saints to reigne on earth are now at hand, and so suffering, or conformity to the image of Christ, no longer the thing wee are predestin'd to; wee must set up a new trade of fighting, destroying, resisting, rebelling, leave enduring to those *Christians which were furnished with extraordinary strength from heaven*. Which are the Objecters words of the Primitive Christians; which, saith hee, kept them from studying cases and questions about lawfulness of escaping (which word meere shame hath put in, utterly impertinently, instead of resisting) I confesse, I had thought our Queen *Mary* Martyrs had had this strength from heaven too; and that it was not like miracles, an extraordinary gift onely for the infancy of the Church: but now it seemes wee must expect to see no more Martyrs, till wee can remove mountaines againe: This Objecter, it is cleare, is resolved against it at this time, and that his actions, as well as writings, will be ready to testifie. For my owne part, I trust I shall be as ready to oppose the one, as I am to confute the other, and to think nothing more Christian still, then to be crucified with my Christ; and if I might chuse the Article of Christian Doctrine which I should most desire to seale with my blood, I thinke it would be that of meeknesse, patience, non-resistance, peaceablenesse, charity, which I conceive Christ hath been so passionately earnest to recommend unto me, as most diametrically opposit to the most unchristian damning finnes of pride, ambition, malice, rebellion, unquietnesse, discontentednesse, &c.

Fourthly, for the whole discourse about Antichrist, there must many things be returned: 1. That it is not tolerable in a Christian to affirme, that God purposely hid truths, that Antichrist might come into the world: This so harsh sense the Objecter first disguises in another phrase, that God *by speciall dispensation suffered him to make many truths his footstoole*; but indeed that reaches not home to the business undertaken to be proved, for it followes not thence, that this of resisting superiours was one of those truths: if it were, then God suffered him to make use of it, which hee could not but by its being made known, whereas hee supposes it was then hid. If hee meane Antichrist hid it, and so made the holding it, his footstoole; Then 1. It was not God that hid it, as before hee said, but Antichrist. 2. It had then been manifest before, and then began to be hid, when there was most occasion to use it; which before hee made improbable. If I were put upon the rack, I could not give a rationall account of those words of the Objecter last recited, or such as may but be consonant to his present undertakings. That which followes is more cleare, that *God caused a dead sleep to fall upon those truths*: If hee did, I wonder who first raised them out of that dead sleep, *Jun. Brutus*, or *Buchan*. or *Mr. Goodwin*? But still it seemes God did on purpose hide truths, in favour and assistance to Antichrist, to help him into the world; and this, not like the spirit of slumber sent on men for their punishment, but on divine truths, which sure

had not deserved it. Yet more particularly, that the doctrine of liberty to resist superiours should be *so opposite in a speciall manner to Antichrist*, that it was faine to be laid asleep to give him passage into his throne, seemeth very strange to me. 1. Because one piece of Antichrists pride is, to exalt himselfe above all that is called God, which is mostly interpreted Kings; and if rightly, then they that doe so enhance the power of the people, as to make the King *universis minorum*, and loose the reins of obedience so farre as to permit resistance, will I feare discern some part of the mark of the Beast upon their own breasts. 2. Because the *τὸ χιρίον*, 2 Thes. 26. and *ὁ χιρίον*, vers. 7. that hindred, or let Antichrist, and was like to doe so still, till he were taken out of the way, was by the Fathers commonly resolved to be the Roman Empire, or Imperiall Sovereignty of Rome: See *Tert. de resurr. c. 24. Ambr. com. in 2 Thes. Hier. qu. 11. ad Algas. Chrys. in 2 Thes. Cyr. Hier. catech. 12. Aug. de civ. Dei, l. 20. c. 19. Laet. l. 7. c. 25. Oecum. in loc. & ib. Sever. & Gen.* and therefore on the sacking of Rome by Alaricus the Goth, S. Jerome presently expected that Antichrist should come; and in his book *ad Ageruchiam de monogam.* wonders that any one would think of marrying at that time. Hence, have learned men observed, was that custome in the most ancient times to pray in their Lyturgies for the lasting of the Roman Empire, that so Antichrist might be long a coming, *Tert. Apol. c. 31. ad Scap. c. 2.* From whence, though nothing else can be demonstratively inferred, yet this certainly may, That in those many Fathers opinion, the power of Kings continuing intire, was not like to help Antichrist in; nor consequently, the bringing down that power, by the revelation of the doctrine of resistance, like to cause an abortion in Antichrists birth, or now tend to the casting him out of the world.

As for the evidence of that Revelation-rule, that the communalty, in opposition to their Kings, must have the great stroke in executing Gods judgement on Antichrist, proved, *Revel. 18. 4, 6, 9.* I must answer, 5. That I shall never wonder enough at the power of Prejudice evidenced in this Objecter, by what hee hath put together to this purpose, pag. 32. To prove that the people contrary to their Kings shall destroy Antichrist, this is thought by him sufficient evidence, that *the people are commanded to goe out of her*, vers. 4. when vers. 9. it followes, that *the Kings of the earth shall bewaile her, and lament for her*: The unconcludingnesse of the Argument I shall not insist on, but onely looke forward to another place which hee cites immediatly, *Revel. 17. 17. Where the ten Kings are said to hate the Whore, and make her desolate.* Now the word *Kings* in this last place signifies, saith the Objecter, not the persons of Kings, but their States and Kingdomes; and to this purpose proofes are produced: But, first, I beseech him to deale ingenuously, Doth the word King ever signifie the Kingdome opposed to the King; 1. Any part of the Kingdome excluding the King? But then, 2. See the mystery of prejudice which I mentioned, where it is for the Objecter's turne, *Revel. 18.* the Kings of the earth, must signifie their persons, in opposition to their people; but where it is not for his

his turne, *Revel. 17.* there the word Kings, must signifie the people, or any but the King. Would not the spirit of meeknesse have easily compounded this businesse, and have given the word [Kings] leave in both places to signifie both their Persons and their Realmes; and so have reconciled the places, that some Kings with their Kingdomes should bewaile her, and some againe hate her; they bewaile her, that continued with her till her destruction, when they see the smoak of her burning, 18. 9. and others hate her, who had once tasted of her filthinesse, and repented and left her before: This were very agreeable to those Texts, if wee had not peremptorily resolved to fetch some other sense out of them. 3. That first place alone by it selfe concludes onely thus much, that good men come (or are exhorted to come) out from Antichrist, and avenge the Whore; and earthly men that have love to her, bewaile her; but not that either the first are all common people, (for sure Kings may be called Gods people, or be in that number) or the second none but Kings. As for the prooffe that those people, *vers. 4.* are the Subjects of those Kings, *vers. 9.* because they are such as come out of *Babylon*, sure that is very weak; for *Babylon* being the Province of the Whore, there may be Kings as well as Subjects there, and those Kings come out too, as well as those Subjects. For, suppose King and People of *England* all Popish, why might they not all reform together? It seems Antichrist must never be cast out of a Kingdome, till the people doe it in spite of the King; and therefore it is concluded, that it was not done here in the dayes of King *Edward*, nor Queen *Elizabeth*, nor King *James*: and now since the new Revelations have assured men, that Antichrist must now be cast out utterly from among us, it is become necessary that our Sovereigne should be a Papist; and as much zeale, and as solid arguments used to perswade our friends that indeed he is so, (though his constant word and actions now evidence the contrary) as are produced to maintain any other article of our new Saints believe: One of the most suspected and hated heresies of these dayes is, to doubt of the Popish affections of our Superiours, especially the King. Well, by this doctrine, if the King should chance not to be a Papist, hee must turne to be one, or else Popery cannot be cast out in his time. If so hee should doe, turne Papist on purpose to prepare, or dispose his Kingdome to turne Antichrist out, this might be but answerable to Gods hiding of truths, to that end to help Antichrist in. But should his Majesty be so malicious as to prove Protestant in earnest, then what would become of that sure word of Prophecy, that so many have been perswaded to depend on, That Antichrist must now be cast out of this Kingdome; which, saith the Objector, cannot be, unless the people do it while the King bewailes. I hope I have said enough of this.

As for the connexion of this observation, with the conclusion in hand, (though it matter little now, the observation is proved so false, yet) I shall adde, that if the people were to doe that great feat of casting out Antichrist, yet it appeares not how liberty of forcible resisting their Kings should be a necessary requisite to the work, unless the lawfull King be the Antichrist in every Country;

Countrey; for otherwise it is very possible, that though they obey their Kings, they may resist Antichrist; though they love and revere their lawfull Superiour, they may hate and abjure their unlawfull. Once more, whereas it is againe repeated, that the *knowledge of the supposed Subjects liberty would have kept Antichrist from his throne*; I repeat again, that if it would, God fure would have revealed it to them of all others; unlesse it appeare, that God was more angry with the sinnes of Christians in *Tertullian's* age, and so more fought against them, then hee doth in ours against us; for though God may of mercy undeserved throw down Antichrist, yet that hee should so immediately and illustriously labour to set him up, unlesse out of deserved indignation to a people, is not easily resolved; yet if this may appeare *de facto* to be so, I shall yeeld; till then, *παύω*.

The last blot laid on *Tertullian*, to obliterate all whatsoever can be fetcht from him, is, That the *authority of Tertullian, and the submission of the Christians, being both Apocryphall, is too light to weigh against the practice of the great Prophet Elisha, &c.* To which I answer, That that being supposed, yet the grounds on which *Tertullian* saith the Christians of his time did so patiently suffer, *viz.* the doctrine of Christian patience and meeknesse, are not Apocryphall, nor inferiour to that of *Elisha*, though it were supposed to be argumentative, or concluding for resistance. For any thing else added by the Objecter in this businesse, as the disproving of *Tertullian's* relations on grounds of Christian doctrine, from the contrary practice of *David* and *Elisha*, though I might answer in one word, That Christians are restrained from some things, which were practised without fault in the Old Testament; yet because those Old Testament-examples have been fully cleared by many others of our Writers, and indeed are not pertinent to the discourse I was upon, when this Objecter first met me in the way, and led me this chace after him, I shall not be so impertinent as to adde any thing, but conceive my selfe to have vindicated the testimonies of those Fathers from all possible objections, and so to have joyned the practice of Christians, (those ancient Primitive ones) and proved them correspondent to the example of Christ, and so to have made good my second Argument, proposed from the example of Christ and Christians.

My third is, from the very making of Christianity, and particularly of the Protestant Doctrine. And 1. Of Christianity, which as it differs from the Lawes both of *Moses* and Nature, so it constantly reformes and perfects those (dissolves not any thing that was morall in them, nor promises impunity for non-performance, but upon repentance and reformation) elevates and raises them up to an higher pitch, at least then Jewes or naturall men had conceived or understood themselves obliged to, which the ancient Fathers generally resolve to be the meaning of his *ἀνὰ ἡμεῖς*, *Mat. 5. 17.* to fill up all vacancies in those former Lawes, and adde unto them that perfection which should be proportionable to that greater measure of grace now afforded under the Gospell. Thus in that Sermon upon the mount, that *ἄκρον τῆς κορυφῆς τῆς φιλοσοφίας*, that top of practical

practicall Divinity, (set down by way of particular instance of Christs purpose, *ὅτι καταλύσαι τὸ νόμον, ἀλλὰ πληρῶσαι*) besides the third proximall beatitude, *Blessed are the meeke*, which certainly though it may containe more, yet excludes not, but principally notes the meeke, obedient subjects under government, the non-resisters, and therefore hath the same promise annex which the Law had given in the fifth Commandement; ('twas there, That thy daies may be long in the Land; 'tis here, They shall possesse the earth, *τὴν γῆν*, which *Psal.* 37. 11. whence it is cited, refers clearly to the land of *Canaan*, though improved into an higher sense now in the Gospell.) And againe, besides the seventh beatitude of the peace-makers, or peaceable, (*εἰρηνοποιοὶ καὶ εἰρηνικοὶ*, being equivalent in the Scripture stile, *vid.* *Jam.* 3. 18.) and the eighth, of those that are persecuted for righteousnesse sake, (whence sure is not excluded the cause of Religion and Christianity it selfe) as also of taking up the Crosse (of which I designe another discourse to speake more largely) which sure are opposite enough to forcible resisting of lawfull Magistrats, especially for Religion: besides all these, I say, in the introduction to that Sermon, there is in the body of the Sermon it selfe, an *Εγὼ λέγω ὑμῖν μὴ ἀντιστεῖσθαι τῷ πονηρῷ*, which sure prohibits all forcible resisting or violence even to the *ὁ πονηρὸς*, the injurious or (*πονηρὸς* from *πόνος*) troublesome person, which if it should chance to be our King, would not certainly be more lawfully or Christianly resisted, then any body else; especially, when it is our religion which is invaded, which of all other things a whole Army of plunderers cannot rob us of, (as they may of the cloake, *vers.* 40.) and therefore needs not our violence to retaine it; nor is ever injured, but more illustrated by our suffering. To this may be added the consideration of the *depositum* left by Christ with his Disciples, *pacem*, peace, *John* 14. 27. (which it seemes onely the beloved disciple had recorded) Peace I leave with you, externall peace, for the *pacem meam*, my peace, followes after as a gift perhaps peculiar to them that prized and kept this legacy: and if it be objected that Christ came not to send peace, but a sword, *Mat.* 10. 34. that sure refers not to Christs prime counsell or purpose, but to the event; what he foresaw it would be, or what he had determined it ought (which manner of speech is very ordinary in all Authors) for the precept is punctuall to *Peter* against the use of the sword, and to all the disciples for preserving of peace, *Mar.* 9. 50. and to that it is thought the mention of salt belongs in that place, which among other qualities is, *ἑωττικόν*, unitive, have salt in your selves, and have peace one with another. On these texts many effectuall emphaticall descendants are added by the Apostles, *Rom.* 12. 18. If it be possible, as much as in you lieth, live peaceably with all men, and *Heb.* 12. 14. follow peace with all men, *ὁ ἰάκετε*, an agonisticall word to run for it as for a prize, or *βραβείον*, and 1 *Thess.* 4. 11. *φιλοπονητέον ἡ ἀλλήλων*, we render it, study (it is, be emulous, contend, strive, make it your ambition) to be quiet, to which I shall onely adde two places more, *Jam.* 3. 17, 18. The wisdom which cometh from above is first pure, then peaceable, &c. Which before, *ver.* 13. he had called meeke

of wisdom, then 1 *Pet.* 3. 3. where after direction for the ὑποταγή τῶν ἡμετέρων ὑποταγή τῶν κυρίων obedience of wives to husbands (and we know the Kingdoms relation to the King is besides others, that of a wife to an husband who is therefore espoused to it with the ring at his Coronation) it is added, ὡς τῷ ἀφάρτῳ τῷ ἀγαθῷ καὶ ἡσυχίᾳ ἀνέμωλος, that her bravery consists in the sincerity (I think it should be rendered) of a meeke and quiet spirit, which is in the sight of God of great price. If it be objected, that these many places of peace are but generall wide illations against resistance, or however, no more pertinent to the case about resisting of Magistrates, then of any other private man: I answer, that though I might thus argue, *à minori*, (and also assume that no other resistance is neare so destructive of peace, as that resisting of the Supreme power, that being indeed the shaking of government it selfe, which is the band of peace, and the dissolving of which returns us to the state of common hostility, leaves us a wilderness of Beares or Tygers, not a society of men) yet I shall confesse, that I intended not to lay any more weight on this part of the Argument, then any man will acknowledge it able to beare, and that therefore before I inferre my conclusion of non-resistance from the making of Christianity, I must adde to these places so passionate for peace, another sort of places concerning obedience, of which (without naming the places being so knowne already) I shall venture this observation, that in the new Testament especially the Epistles of the Apostles (which were all written in time of the reigne of wicked Heathen bloody adversaries of Christianity, and can referre to none but those) there is no one Christian vertue, or Article of Faith more cleerly delivered, more effectually enforced upon our understandings and affections to be acknowledged by the one (against all pretence of Christian liberty to the contrary) and submitted to by the other, then that of obedience to Kings, &c. It were most easie to vindicate those places from all the glosses and scholia's that the writers of this year, Mr. *Goodwin* in *anticav.* Mr. *Bur.* Mr. *Bridges,* &c. have invented to free themselves and others from the obedience most strictly required there, but I would not againe trouble any ingenuous man with such extravagant discourses as even now I learnt by experience would be necessary to answer such exceptions, which mens wit or somewhat worse hath produced; besides, those places have bene by others vindicated already. I shall onely say, whosoever can without coloured spectacles find ground for the present resistance in those places of Scripture, *Rom.* 13. 1 *Pet.* 2. 13. 18, &c. so farre as to settle and quiet a conscience, I shall not conceive my understanding fit to duell with his, any more then I would wrestle with a fiend, or combate with the fire, which *Pythagoras* tels me would avails little; he that can be sure that damnation (*Rom.* 13. 2.) signifies not damnation, but some temporary mulekt onely (if the King should prove able to inflict it) when, vers. 5. it is added we must needs be subject, not onely for wrath, (*i. e.* feare of temporary punishment) but also for conscience sake, (which when it accuses, bindes over to eternall wrath, or damnation) I professe I know not what camell he may not swallow; I shall onely in the bowels

bowels of Christ desire him to consider, what a sad condition it would prove, if being on this confidence engaged, and by Gods hand taken away in this warre he should at Gods tribunall heare Saint *Paul* avouch, that by *xp̄ma* or damnation in that place, he did meane no lesse then eternall damnation without repentance: O how would his countenance change, his thoughts trouble him, the joynts of his loynes be loosed, and his knees finite one against another, one generall *αἰσῶς* possesse all his faculties, and Mr. *Bridg* &c. be unable to settle him or give him confidence any longer, when the *Tekel* shall come out of the wall over against that interpretation of his, that it is weighed in the ballance (of truth and judgement) and found wanting; Of this word *xp̄ma* I designe another disquisition: onely I could not deferre to forewarne the Reader of his danger in this place, and now I shall not doubt from the making of Christianity to inferre my conclusion of non-resistance, not doubting but the premises will beare it.

For the other part of this third Argument from the making of the Protestant Doctrine, I would faine be very briefe by way of compensation for my former importunity, and therefore shall engage my selfe not to trouble the Reader with citations or names, which yet might be brought by hundreds of reformed Writers for every *Junius Brutus*, and *Buchanan* that hath appeared for the contrary since the Reformation. Though the truth is, suchas these if they must be called Protestants, are yet in this somewhat more then that title ever imported, I may say perfect Jesuits in their principles, and resolutions concerning Kings (no Papiists of any other Order hath gone so farre) although they differ somewhat in the seat of that power of making such resistance. That which I designed to say on this point is onely this; That the doctrine of Allegiance to Kings, and of their supremacy in all causes, hath alwayes beene counted a principall head of difference betweene the Protestants and the worst of Papiists, and a speciall evidence, which most men have used, to conclude the Papacy to be *ὁ Αντιχριστος* the Antichrist, is this that the Pope exalteth himselfe above all that is called God: 1. The Kings of the earth, that he in case the King be not a Catholicke, absolves Subjects from their Allegiance to him, that he pretends power over them in spirituall things, and in temporall in *ordine ad spiritualia*. It is not unknowne to any that the Oath of Supremacy if not of Allegiance among us is principally designed to discern and discover Papiists, of whom, one of the prayers appointed for the fifth of *November* affirms, that their Religion is Rebellion, that sure is, that one maine difference betwixt Romish and English, Popish, and Protestant doctrine, is that of liberty to Rebell in some cases, particularly in that of Religion: In opposition to all which doctrines or insinuations of theirs, there is no Church that ever-expresseth their sense in any Article more fully and largely, then ours hath in this particular, witnesse the severall parts of the Homily of Disobedience and Rebellion, printed in Queene *Elizabeths* time. And if herein all other parts of the Reformed Church have not gone as farre as we, yet shall I not retract my asserting this doctrine purely

Protestant, 1. Because this Kingdome hath alwayes beene esteemed a prime part of the Reformation, wherein the Papacy was legally cast out, not by violence or tumults of the people, and so nothing rejected but what in sobriety was necessary to be rejected, and therefore our Church hath generally beene the *Norma*, or rule, by which others have desired to compose themselves, and never yet any other so preferred before us, as that our ancestours could thinke fit to conformance to them. 2. Because in many other countie the government is not Regall, or Monarchicall, as here it is, *Bodin. l. 2. c. 5. de rep.* can finde none of this nature in *Europe*, but *France* and *Spaine*, and *England* and *Scotland* (I conceive *Ireland* he contained under the word *Angliam*) in which, saith he, *Reges sine controversâ jura omnia majestatis habent per se : Singulis civibus nec universis fas est* (it seemes Master Dale our Embassadour, from whom he had received his advertisement of the state of this Kingdome had not then heard that our King, though *Singulis major, is universis minor*, which certainly had divested him of all Sovereignty, it being impossible that the Sovereigne or Supreme of all should be *Minor* then any) *Summi principum vitam, famam aut fortunas in discrimen vocare, seu vi, seu judicio consistit id fiat, &c.* As for the Emperour of Germany, *Charles* the fifth by name, he saith plainly, *Tyrannide cives ad rempublicam oppressit, cum jura majestatis non haberet*, which if it be true, will be some excuse to the Germane Princes in what they did at that time in taking up Armes for Religion, though it is most certaine what he affirms, that when those Princes consulted *M. Luther* about it, *num id jure divino liceret*, whether it were lawfull in the sight of God, *Ille negavit*, he resolved it utterly unlawfull: this answer, saith *Bodin*, *Luther* gave *Perinde atque si Carolus summum imperii solus haberet*, and therefore much more must it be given when the case is of a Monarch indeed, as he concludes; and though he acknowledge that distinction, which it seemes *Luther* did not, betwixt that Emperour and true Monarchs, yet is he faine to passe a sad observation upon the fact of those Princes, in taking up Armes for Religion, against *Luther's* advice, *Ita funestum bellum reique publica calamitosum susceptum est, cum ingenti principum ac civium strage, quia justa causa nulla videri potest adversus patriam arma sumendi*. I would to God those words were Englisht in every of our hearts: a direfull and calamitous warre with the slaughter of all sorts, because (though it were for Religion) yet no cause can be counted just of taking up Arms against one's country. The truth is, what was done there though, 1. very unhappily, and 2. against no Monarch, hath been thought imitable by *Knox* and *Buchanan* in *Scotland*, and from thence infused into some few into *England*, as *Penry*, &c. But by Gods providence hath formerly beene timously restrained, and not broken out to the defaming of our Protestant profession. It seemes now our finnes are ripe for such a judgement, the land divided into two extreame sinfull parts; one by their finnes fitted to suffer under this doctrine, others sinfull enough to be permitted to broach and prosecute it. I meekly thanke God, that though my
finis

sins are strangely great, yet he hath not given me up to that latter judgement. I conceive I have also given some hints at least of proving my position from the making of the Protestant Doctrine.

Now for the last Topicke, taken from the constitution of this Kingdome. Though that be the Lawyers taske, very prosperously undertaken by others, yet one generall notion there is of our Laws, which from my childhood I have imbibed, and therefore conceive common to all others with me ; and it is this, That the Lawes of this Kingdome put no man (no Papiſts I am sure) to death for Religion. When Jesuits and Seminary-Priests have suffered, every man is so perfect in the Law, as to know that it is for Treason, by a Statute that makes it such for them to come into this Kingdome. The truth of this, and the constant pleading of it against all Objecters, hath made me swallow it as a principle of our Law, that even Popery strictly taken (and not only as now this last yeare it hath learnt to enlarge its importance) is no capitall crime. From whence, I profess, I know no impediment to forbid me to conclude, that in the constitution of our State no warre for Religion is accounted a lawfull warre ; for that it should be lawfull to kill whole multitudes without any enditement, yea, and by attempting it, to endanger, at least, our owne, 1. Many good Protestants lives, for that, which if it were proved against any single man, would not touch his life in the least degree, is, I must acknowledge, one of the *Arcana belli* which I cannot see into. And therefore *Sleidan* tells us of *M. Luther*, that he would not allow a warre, though but defensive, with the Turke himselfe, *com. lib. 13. pag. 403.* and though after he had mitigated his opinion upon a new state of the question, and perswaded the Emperour to it, yet it was with this limitation, *Modo nec vindicta, nec gloria, nec emolumenti causa subeat*, (three things that are very rarely kept out of warre) *sed tantum ut sparsissimum latronem, non ex religionis, sed furti & injuriarum actione aggrediantur*. It seemes the cause of religion, although it were of Christianity against Mahometisme, was not to him a sufficient warrant for a defensive war. But then 2. For this warre to be waged against the Prince, (or by any one but the Prince, in a Monarchie, as this is) who whatsoever he hath not, hath certainly the power of the sword immediatly from God (or else must be acknowledged not to have it at all, for this power cannot be in any people originally, or any where but in God, and therefore it may be most truly said, that though the regall power were confest to be first given by the people, yet the power of the sword, wherewith regality is endowed, would be a superaddition of Gods, never belonging to regall or whatever other power, till God annex it: in *Gen. 9. 6.* which also seemes to be out of all dispute in this Kingdome, even at this time, where the universall body of the commonalty, even by those that would have the regall power originally in them, is not yet affirmed to have any aggregate power, any farther then every man single out of government was presumed to have over himselfe, which sure was not power of his owne life ; for even in nature there is *Felonia de se*, and therefore the representative

body of the Commons, is so farre from being a Judicature in capitall matters, that it cannot administer an oath) and therefore is not justly invisable by any subject, or community of subjects, who certainly have not that power, nor pretend to have it, and when they take it, thinke it necessary to excuse that fact by pretence of necessity, which every body knowes, is the colour for those things which have no ordinary meanes of justifying them (like that which Divines say of saving of children and ideots, &c. by some extraordinary way.) Nay, 3. For this warre to be waged, not against Popery, truly so called, but against the onely true Protestant Religion, as it stands (and by attempting to make new Lawes is acknowledged as yet to stand) establisht by the old Lawes of the Land, and therefore is faine to be called Popish (and our Martyr-reformers not able, by those fiery chariots of theirs, to get out of the confines of *Babylon*) that it may be fit to be destroyed ; just as the Primitive Christians were by the persecuters put in wilde beasts skins, that in those shapes they might be devoured : this I confesse is to me a complication of riddles, (and therefore put by some Artiste under that deep-dark-pharse, and title of Fundamentall Lawes of the Kingdome) to which certainly no liberty or right of the subject in *Magna Carta*, no nor legislative power, will enable any man to give any intelligible, much lesse legall name : At which I professe I am not ill pleased, because this I hope will keepe it from being recorded to posterity.

I have done with my fourth Argument, and am heartily sorry I have kept my Reader so long from his prayers, which must set an end to this controversie, for sure Arguments are too blunt to doe it ; I beseech God to direct all our hearts to a constant use of those meanes (together with fasting and abstinence, at least from farther provoking sins) to exorcize that evill spirit that hath divided his titles (of *ἐχθρος ἄνθρωπος*, *Σάτανας*, *διάβολος*, *κατήγρος τῶν ἀδελφῶν*, and now at length, *ἀββαδὼν*, & *ἀπολλυὼν*) among us, and by those meanes infused his mortiferous poison into the very veins of this whole Kingdome. [I create the fruit of the lips, peace, peace to him that is farre off, &c. and I will heale him. Thou hast moved the land, and divided it, heale the sores thereof, for it shaketh.]

Of the
word
κρίμα.

The word *κρίμα*, according to its origination signifies Censure, Judgement, and in its making hath no intimation, either of the quality of the offence to which that judgement belongs, or of the Judge who inflicts it : that it belongs to humane judgements, or sentences of temporall punishments sometimes, is apparent by *Luke* 23. 40. where one thiefe saith to the other, *ὅτι ὡς αὐτῷ κρίματι εἶ*, meaning it seemes, the same sentence of death, or capitall punishment, called *κρίμα θανάτου*, c. 24. 20. judgement of death, temporall ; and that at other times it signifies also divine judgement, is as apparent, *Αἰθ.* 24. 26. *τὸ κρίμαλος τῷ μέλλοντι ἐσθλαί*, judgement to come, that is, certainly at the end of this world, at the day of dooime. So *Rom.* 2. 2. *κρίμα τῷ Θεῷ*, the judgement of God, and so againe, vers. 3. which vers. 5. is explained to be wrath or punishment against the day of wrath, &c. so *Heb.* 6. 2. resurrection of the dead, and

and eternall judgement. The truth is in this sense it is most-what taken in this Booke, see *Matth.* 23. 14. *Mar.* 12. 40. *Luke* 20. 47. *Rom.* 3. 8. and therefore *Hesychius*, the best Glossary for the new-Testament, renders it *κρίμα*, ἐνταπώσεως Θεοῦ, Gods retribution or payment, or rendering according to works. It will not be worth while to survey and consider every place where the word is used, he that shall doe so, will perhaps resolve with me to accept of that glossary, and understand it constantly of Gods judgment; unless, when the circumstances of the place shall inforce the contrary, as they doe in the places first mentioned, and 1 *Cor.* 6. 7. But then when the context rather leads to the second sense, there will be great danger for any man to apply it to humane judgements, for by so doing, hee may flatter himselfe or others in some sin, and run into that *κρίμα*, as it signifies eternall judgement, when by that mis-understanding he doth not conceive himselfe in any danger of it. Of places which without all controversie thus interpret themselves; I will mention two, 2 *Pet.* 2. 3. οἷς τὸ κρίμα ἐκπαύλαι ἕκ ἐργῶν, wee render it, whose judgement of a long time lingereth not: which that it belongs to eternall vengeance, appears by the next words, ἡ ἀπόληα αὐτῶν ἔνυσάβη, wee render it, Their damnation, it is literally, Their destruction sleepech not. The second place is, 1 *Tim.* 3. 6. εἰς κρίμα ἱμπίση τῷ διαβόλῃ, fall into the condemnation of the Devil; that is, sure into that sentence that fell upon *Lucifer* for his pride (being cast out of Heaven, and reserved to chaines of eternall darknesse) for the person spoken of here, is the Novice, or new Convert, lifted up with pride, just parallel to the Angells newly created, lifted up with pride also, the crimes and the persons parallel, and so sure the punishment also. Now three places more there are which appeare to me by the same meanes of evidence, or rule of interpreting, to belong to the same sense, though I cannot say of them as I did before, [without controversie] For I see it is not onely doubted by some, whether they doe belong to this sense or no, but that it is resolved they doe not: which resolution sure must be obnoxious to some danger, that I say no worse of it. The first of these places is, *Rom.* 13. 2. οἱ δὲ ἀνθεσικότες ἑαυτοῖς κρίμα λήσουσιν: we render it, They that resist shall receive to themselves damnation: But say others, it must be rendred judgement, as that signifies some temporary punishment which the higher powers may inflict, and nothing else: and this they labour to make appeare by the words following: For Rulers are a terrour to evill works, and he beareth not the sword in vaine, &c. To which I answer, That there is no doubt made by me or any, but that Rulers are to punish men for evill works, particularly that of resistance against them, and not onely that, but also crimes against our brethren, and God; and in that respect it is added, *vers.* 4. Θεὸς διάκονος ἐστὶν ἐκδικῶν: εἰς ὀργὴν τῷ τὸ κακὸν ποιοῦσιν, the Minister or officer of God he is, and executioner for wrath, that is, punishment temporall to him (indefinitely) that doth evill. But doth it follow from hence, that either he that makes forcible resistance against the Superiour or Supreme power, or that commits any other sinne (which the Supreme power is set to avenge or

punish temporally) shall incurre no eternall punishment? If this new Divinity should be entertained, it must be priviledge and protection to other sins, as well as resistance and rebellion, even to all that any judicall lawes have power to punish, for in these also he is the Minister of God, *ἐκδικὸς ἐν ὀργῇ*, an avenger, or executioner for punishment, and there is no avoiding it; but this must be extended indefinitely, or universally, *τῷ τὸ κακὸν πράσσοντι*, to any malefactor punishable by that power, or that comes under this cognizance; and so by this Logicke, he that is hanged, may not be damned, what ever his crime be; an execution on earth shall be as good as a Purgatory to excuse him from any other punishment. But then secondly, suppose a Rebelle escape the hand of justice here below, by flight, &c. nay, that he prosper in his rebellion, and get the better of it, that the King be not able to punish him; nay, yet farther, that he proceed higher, Despoile the King, and get into his place, What *κρίμα* is he like to receive, if that signifie onely the Kings wrath or temporall punishment? Sure this prosperousnesse of the crime must make it cease to be a crime, make it commence vertue, as the Turkes on their principles are wont to resolve it, saith *Busbequius, Ep. 4.* — *Ex opinione qua Turcis insedit ut res quocunque consilio institutas, si bene cadunt, ad Deum Authorem referant, &c.* Or else give it, (though it be a sinne never so great, and unrepented of) perfect impunity both in this world, and in another: And certainly this is no jest, for he that observes the behaviours of many men, (the no manner of regrets or reluctancies in their course of forcible resistance, (save onely when they conceive it goes not on so prosperously as it was wont) and the great weekly industry that is used to perswade all men of the continued prosperity of the side, as being conceived farre more usefull and instrumentall to their ends, then the demonstration of the justice of it, mens consciences being resolved more by the Diurnall, then the Bible, by the Intelligencer then the Divine, unlesse he turne Intelligencer also, I would we had not so many of those Pluralists.) Will have reason to resolve that this Divinity is the principle by which they move; which if it be not yet brought to absurdities enough, then looke a little forward to the conclusion, deduced and inferr'd vers. 5. Wherefore ye must be subject, not onely for wrath, but also for conscience sake. Words by Prophetick Spirit added by the Apostle, as it were on purpose to contradict *in terminis*, that new interpretation. Wrath signifies that temporall punishment, vers. 4. which if it were the all that is meant by *κρίμα*, then how can it be true, that we must be subject not onely for wrath? Certainly he that resists is not subject (*ἀντιστάτω*, is all one with *ἀντιτάσσεται*, and both directly contrary to *ὑποτάσσεται*, the word used both in the third and fifth verse) and therefore if we must be subject not onely for wrath, as that signifies temporall punishment, then he that resists, shall receive more then wrath, as that signifies temporall punishment, *viz.* *κρίμα*, in our rendering, condemnation, if he doe not prevent it timously by repentance: which sure is the importance of the *ἀλλὰ καὶ διὰ συνείδησιν*, but also for conscience sake; that if he doe it not, it will be

be sin to him, wound his conscience, bind him over to that punishment which belongs to an accusing conscience, (which sure is more then a temporall mulct) which is farther cleare from the first verse of that Chapter, the command of subjection. For sure, every Divine or Apostolicall command entred into the Canon of Scripture, doth bind conscience; and the breach of it, knowne and deliberate, is no lesse then a damning sinne, even under the Gospel, mortiferous and destructive without repentance; which is just equivalent to the *ῥήμα ὁλοθῆναι*, he shall receive damnation, in our way of interpreting it. So much for that first place.

The second is, *1 Cor. 11. 29.* He that eateth and drinketh unworthily, eateth and drinketh damnation (or as our margent, judgement) to himselfe, &c. This place I find avouched for the confirming of the former interpretation, *Rom. 13.* That *ῥήμα* signifies onely temporall punishment; and thus it is known the Socinians commonly interpret this place, *per ῥήμα non sempiternam damnationem nominatum, sed supplicium in genere intelligendum esse.* Volkelius *l. 9. de ver. rel. l. 4. c. 22.* That which is used to perswade this to be probable, is that which followes *vers. 30.* for this cause many are weak and sickly among you, and many sleep; which belonging onely to temporall punishments, is conceived to be a periphrasis of the *ῥήμα*, judgement, which should seem consequently to be so also: And, indeed, *Volkelius* hath added other proofes, 1. Because the Apostle speaks of any one single act of this sin of unworthy receiving, (not of any habit, or custome) which hee conceives not actually damning now under the second Covenant. 2. Because it is *vers. 32.* and when we are judged, we are chastened of the Lord, that we should not be condemned, &c. To these three (and I know not that there are produced any more) probabilities, I conceive cleare satisfaction may be given by those who affirme *ῥήμα* to contain in it eternall punishment: Though if it were onely temporall punishment, yet being sickness, &c. which are not inflicted by the Magistrate, but by the hand of God, it will not come home to that which was by Master *Br.* affirmed of the word in *Rom. 13.* For this must be premised, that wee doe not conceive it to signifie eternall punishments, *exclusive*, or so as to exclude temporall, but eternall and sometimes temporall too; (for so sure hee that for his rebellion receives damnation, hereafter, is not secured from being hang'd, drawn, and quarter'd here) or else eternall if hee repent not, and perhaps temporall though hee doe: by *ῥήμα*, as I said, I understand with *Hesychius*, *ἀνταποδοσὶν οὐκ*, Gods vengeance, whether here, or in another world; but, I say, in this place both of them, (and so ordinarily in the former also.) This being premised, the word *ῥήμα* may still containe in it eternall punishments, *vers. 29.* though many for this cause of unworthy receiving did fall sick and die, *vers. 30.* for 1. they might both die and be damned too; or if, as *Volkelius* saith, the word *κοιμῶνται*, *obdormiscunt*, sleep, be never used in the New-Testament, of those that are destined to eternall destruction, then still may this be very reconcileable with our interpretation, that many for this cause are weak and sickly, and many others sleep, God chastising

some by diseases to reforme them, and punishing others, who, as *Volkelius* acknowledges, were guilty onely of some single act of the sinne onely, with death temporall, or shortning their dayes; which certainly hinders not but that God might punish others that did customarily commit this sinne (and perhaps with greater aggravations) with no lesse then eternall death, however that it were just for him to doe so, whatever hee did, it is plaine by vers. 27. which is parallel to the 29. Whosoever shall eat and drink unworthily, shall be guilty of the body and blood of the Lord; that is, in *Volkelius* his own words, *Ipsum Christi corpus ac sanguinem contemnere & ignominia afficere, ac quantum in ipsis est profanare proculcareque censendi sum*, shall be thought to contemne and disgrace, and as much as in them lies to profane, and tread under feet the body and blood of Christ; which, what is it but to count the blood of the Covenant an unholy thing, *Heb. 10. 29*? Which yet there is used as a maine aggravation of that sinne, for which, saith the Apostle, there remains no more sacrifice, vers. 26. It is apparent that the phrase *τοιοῦτο τὸ σῶμα*, guilty of the body, &c. is parallel to the Latine, *Reus Majestatis*, used for a Traitor, and sure signifies no lesse then a guilt of a great injury to Christ; which how any man can affirme to be a sinne to which no damnation belongs, (supposing no antidote of invincible ignorance or weakness, nor recovery by repentance, nor gracious pardon of God in not imputing some single act of it) I profess my selfe not to discern, though I think I have weighed impartially all that is said of it. This discourse will keep the first prooffe from being any longer probable; and for the second, (or first of *Volkelius*) it is already in effect answered too; for though hee that is guilty onely of some one act of this sinne found mercy, yet sure they that are guilty of the customary sinne, may speed worse: and indeed of all indefinitely the Apostle speaks according to the sinne; as when hee saith, The drunkard and adulterer shall not inherit the kingdome of God: Where yet perhaps he that is guilty onely of one such act, may find mercy. For the last prooffe, I conceive it so farre from being a probable one against me, that I shall resolve it a convincing one on my side; for if those that were sick, &c. were chastened of the Lord, that they should not be condemned, then sure if they had not been so chastened, nor reformed by that chastening, they should have been condemned with the world; and so their temporall judgements may be a meanes, through the mercy of God in Christ, to free them from their eternall, but not an argument that eternall was not due to them, but a perfect intimation that it was.

The third place (which is not indeed of much importance in it selfe, but only is used to give countenance to the interpretation in the two former places) is *1 Pet. 4. 17*. The time is come that judgement must begin at the house of God. Here, say they, *κρίμα* judgement, is that that befalls the house of God, the godly; therefore but temporall judgements.

To which I answer in a word, that here is a mistake in applying judgement in its latitude to the house of God, when onely it is affirmed by Saint Peter of the *τὸ ἀρχαῖον χρίμα*, or *τὸ πρῶτον*, the beginning or first part of judgement:

for:

for of the *κρίμα*, or judgement, in this verse, there are specified two parts, τὸ *πρῶτον*, the first part, and τὸ *τελος*, the end (or as the word *τέλος* seems to sound in our English, the taile) of it; as *Psal.* 75. 8. the cup of Gods displeasure, or punitive justice, is supposed to consist of two parts, 1. red wine, (or *ἀκρατον*) and 2. mixture of myrrhe and other poysonous bitter spices, called *δέμος*, *Apocal.* 4. 10. and *χολή*, *Mat.* 24. 17. and both together, *δμος ἰσχυριζόμενος*, myrrhate wine, *Mar.* 15. 25. Now, this cup is poured out, and tasted of indefinitely, by the godly some part of it; but the dregs thereof, *i.e.* the myrrhe-bitter part, that goes to the bottome, is left for the wicked to wring out and drink: so that onely the tolerable, supportable, easie part of the judgement belongs unto the godly; but the end, the dregs, the unsupportable part, to those that obey not the Gospel of God. Or yet a little further, the beginning or first part, τὸ *πρῶτον*, of the judgement, is ἀπ' *ἡμῶν*, from the godly, (and so it was ἀρχαῖον ἀπὸ τοῦ δικῆς *δεῦ*) intimating, that the judgement doth not stay upon them, but onely take rise from them: but the τὸ *τέλος*, the second, sadder part of it, is *τῶν ἀπειθέων*, of them, (or belongs to them) that obey not, &c. So that still in this place also, *κρίμα* signifies Gods judgement of this life and another both; not of this life onely, to the excluding of the other, but one part in this life, another in that other: And though the godly had their part in it, yet there was somewhat in the *κρίμα* that the godly never tasted of, but onely the *ἀπειθέων*, they that disobeyed the Gospel of God: and this is apparent by *vers.* 18. For if the righteous *μόλις σώζονται*, wee read it, scarcely be saved; it signifies (by comparing that place with *Pro.* 11. 31. where instead of recompensed on the earth, the Greek translation reads, *μόλις σώζονται*) be rendred unto, or recompensed, *i.e.* punished in the earth, then where shall the ungodly and sinners appeare? There are againe the two parts of *κρίμα*, one *ἀνταπόδοσις* *δεῦ*, Gods retribution to sinne here, wherein the godly have their part; and the other, his rendering to the wicked hereafter; and so neither of them the punishment of the Magistrate in this life, as Mr. *Bridg.* out of *Piscator*, contends to have it, *Rom.* 13. and as it must be here also, if others speake pertinently, who use it to avoid that interpretation, which I confesse Mr. *Bridg.* doth not.

They that are unlearned and unstable wrest the Scriptures to their owne destruction. Yee therefore beloved, seeing yee know these things before, beware lest you also be led away with the errour of the wicked, and fall from your owne stedfastnesse, 2 Pet. 3. 16, 17.

Of the Zealots among the I E W E S, and the Liberty taken by them.

Here was among the Jewes, either truly or pretendedly, a *judicium Zelotarum*, a peculiar liberty or power of Zealots, (i.e. of private men led by zeale) to punish or execute Malefactors, whether with death, or any lower punishment. These they stile Pious-men inflamed with the zeale of God: And these were wont, when they found any man in the fact, guilty of sedition, blasphemy, or any other crime of the greater size, openly and publicly committed, presently to set upon him, to smite, and if need were, to kill him, without any process of Law against him.

The originall of these came from the fact of *Phinees*, Num. 25.7. of whom *Mattathias*, in his dying oration to his sonnes, hath these words, Φινεῖς ὁ πατήρ ἡμῶν ἐν τῷ ζηλωσῶναι ζῆλον ἔλαβε διαδύχην ἱεροσύνης ἀμάνειν. *Phinees* our father (by zealing the zeale of God, saith the Vulgar Latine) by behaving himselfe zealously, received the promise of an eternall Priesthood, 1 Mac. 2. 54. Which is also affirmed of *Elias*, vers. 58. Ἠλίας ἐν τῷ ζηλωσῶναι ζῆλον νόμου ἀνελήφθη εἰς τὸ ἔρηνον. *Elias* by zealing the zeale of the Law, or behaving himselfe zealously for the Law, was received up to heaven; (which belongs to that fact of *Elias*, immediately before his assumption, when he call'd twice for fire from heaven on *Abaziah's* messengers, 2 King. 1. 10, 12. unless you will rather apply it to that fact of his, 1 King. 18. 40. against the Prophets of *Baal*, whom hee apprehended and slew together every man of them:) by which examples hee there stirres up and incites his sonnes, ζηλωσάτω τῷ νόμῳ, to be zealous for the Law, vers. 50. though not to commit any such particular act of that nature, as that which those had done.

Testimonies of Jewish Writers to this purpose, Master *Selden* hath put together in his book, *De jure Natnr. & Gent. ad Heb. plac. lib. 4. cap. 4.* and given some hints of explaining some difficulties in the New-Testament from thence. To this belongs that fact of Christ, Joh. 2. 15. as appeares by the Disciples; of whom it is said, vers. 17. that upon that occasion they remembred how it was written by the Psalmist, Psal. 69. 9: The zeale of thy house, or for thy house, κατέφαγέ με, hath fed on me, or carried me with a kind of fury.

That Christ did not take upon him to be a Magistrate, or a Judge, or a publike person here on earth, is sufficiently acknowledged: as also, that as a private man hee neither did, nor attempted any thing contrary to the Lawes or customs of the Jewes or Romans: Or if hee had, that the Jewes who had a competent measure

measure of animosity against him, would not probably have suffered him to have done it Scot-free. From all which it will follow undoubtedly, that this was done by Christ, *jure Zelorum*, by the power that belonged to the Zealots, for whom onely the Law allowed this liberty. The same is to be said of that attempt of the Jewes, *Job. 10. 31.* ἐβάσανται ἐν πάλιν λίθους οἱ Ἰουδαῖοι ἡνὰ λίθάσωσιν αὐτόν, The Jewes therefore carried stones again that they might stone him, no legall processe having preceded.

The same Master *Selden* notes of the servant of the High Priest that struck Christ, *Job. 18. 22.* whose answer is a seeming argument of it, *vers. 23.* If I have spoken well, why smitest thou me? intimating, that if hee had said any thing amisse, or irreverently of the High Priest, hee should not have questioned his striking him: And yet the truth is, the phrase μαρτύρησον περὶ τοῦ χακῆ, beare witness of the evil, seems an advertisement, that if Christ had offended, it would have better become the servant to have accused and witnessed against him, proceeded legally, then thus, *jure Zelorum*, to have stricken him. On the same ground was the fact of *Ananias*, *Act. 23. 2.* though sitting in the *Sanhedrin*; when he appointed *Paul* to be smitten, though without any just crime also. The like proceedings the Scribes were, it seemes, afraid of, *Luk. 20. 6.* The people will stone us: which must have been an act of popular zeale, without publike judgement. That Saint *Steven*, *Act. 7. 57.* was stoned after this manner, is observed by *Hugo Grotius*, and certainly upon good reasons; for although hee were accused of blasphemy, *c. 6.* and false witnesses brought to that purpose, yet after that, there was nothing legally past against him through all the seventh Chapter, beside his Apology for himselfe to the High Priest. In the conclusion of which (no sentence passing against him) it followes, that the people διεπίσαντο τοῖς ἡρεσίαις αὐτῶν καὶ ἐβρουχον τῆς ὑπόψιας ἐπ' αὐτόν, *vers. 54.* which *Hesychius* will help us to render thus, They were very angry, they were madd with fury or zeale against him, and gnashed their teeth (it seems that flame of zeale produced the same effect in them that the flames of hell are said to doe, *Mat. 8. 12.*) against him, and crying with a loud voice, they stopp'd their eares, and ran with one accord upon him, (all which, were evidences of a most violent zeale) and cast him out of the City, and stoned him; which out of doubt was not now lawfull for the Jewes, (all power of capitall punishment being before this taken from them, *Job. 8. 31.*) nor before legall condemnation ever lawfull by the common way of proceeding; no nor after condemnation, to be done thus tumultuously by the people: save onely that by the liberty of Zealots it was permitted. So *Act. 14. 19.* it befell Saint *Paul*, (God in his providence permitting him to be thus dealt with, by way of retaliation, for his having an hand in stoning Saint *Steven*, when *Barnabas* met not with the like adventure) certaine Jewes that came from *Antioch* and *Iconium* having stoned *Paul*, &c. by this judgement onely of zeale, which we now speake of.

Hither perhaps we may referre that of the Jewes, who brought the woman taken in Adultery to Christ, that she might be stoned; not desiring, as it appears,

that Christ should give sentence of death on her by ordinary legall iudicature, (for neither was Christ a Judge, nor had the Jewes now power of capitall punishment) but by the liberty of Zealots, which was thought principally to belong to that case of one taken in *αὐτοφάγῳ*, in the very fact, as appeares by the example of *Phinees*. So *Act. 23.* that *Κραυγὴ μεγάλη*, great cry (such as was observed in the story of Saint *Steven*) was the beginning of the flaming of zeale, and *vers. 10.* it followes, that the chiefe Captaine, or Tribune, sent Souldiers to rescue and defend *Paul*, that hee might not be taken by that party of Zealots, who, *vers. 12.* had bound themselves under a curse, that they would neither eat nor drink untill they had slain *Paul*; who sure could not have done so *impune*, had it not been thus indulged to them, as Zealots. So when *James* and *John* demand of Christ, whether they should command fire from heaven to descend on a Village of the Samaritans, *Luk. 9. 54.* this they did by the liberty of Zealots, for the legality of their action taking their pattern from the example of *Elias*, and presuming of the power to doe it, because *Elias* had. (In reference to both which, wee read of *πνεῦμα καὶ δύναμις Ἠλίου*, *Luk. 1. 17.* the spirit and power of *Elias*; that spirit, by which hee was incited to that act of zeale, and that power by which hee could call for fire from heaven; whereupon it is *Procopius* his expresseion of *Elias*, that hee was *θεῶ πυρπολεῖ μνος ζήλῳ*, accended with divine zeale, or set on fire by it.) Now when Christ reprehendeth those Disciples, telling them they knew not, *i.e.* considered not, what spirit they were of; hee aduersifeth them that this practice of Zealots is not agreeable to the spirit of the Gospel, nor generally to the temper which hee came to plant among Christians.

And having now among the Apostles of Christ themselves found some footsteps of the Jewish zeale, 'twill not be amiss to interpose a conjecture, that from the same originall sprung that bloody fact of *Peter*, cutting off *Malchus* his eare, *Mat. 26. 51.* For that this was not lawfull for him to doe, or justifiable by the ordinary rule, may be guest by Christs answer of reproofe and vouching the Law, (All they that take the sword, shall perish by the sword;) and yet that it was not a fact very enormous among the Jewes, or being compared with their avowed practices (though clearly forbidden by the Gospel) *Origen* and *Theophylast* seem to intimate. *Origen* on *Mat. 26.* *Unus eorum qui erant cum Jesu nondum manifestè concipiens apud se Evangelicam patientiam illam tradidit sibi à Christo, nec pacem quam dedit Discipulis suis, sed secundam potestatem datam Judais per legem de inimicis, extendens manum accipit gladium, &c.* One of them that were with Jesus, having not yet any full cleare conception of that Evangelicall patience delivered them by Christ, nor of that peace which hee gave to his Disciples, but according to the power given the Jewes by the law of enemies, took out his sword, &c. *Theophylast* yet more clearly in *Mat. 26.* *καὶ ἐχελόμεν ὁ Πέτρος, ὃς ἔχον ὅτις ἐαυτοῦ ἀντὶ ὅτις διδουχθεῖς ἐκλάσας τὸ ἐπαιήσεν, ὃ δὲ κύριος μεταρρυθμίζων αὐτὸν ἐν ἐπαγγελικῇ πολιτείᾳ διδδουκα μὴ χρῆσθαι μαχίρᾳ καὶ τὸ διὸν δοκεῖ τῆς ἐκδικαίᾳ.* Let us not find faule with

with *Peter*; for what hee did, hee did out of zeale, not for himselfe, but for his Master: but the Lord reducing him to the Gospel-discipline, teaches him not to use the sword, though thereby a man should seeme to defend or vindicate God himselfe. And in another place in *Luke*, Ζηλοῦσι μαθηταὶ καὶ μαχαίρας ἀναστέρονται, the Disciples are mov'd with zeale, and draw swords. And in a third place in *Mark*, Ἀποσιναῖα τὸ δογμα ὁ Μάρκος, ἵνα μὴ ἐδῇ ἐπαινεῖν τὸ διδάσκαλον αὐτοῦ Πέτρον, ὡς ζηλώσαυλα ὡς χριστῷ, intimating, that *Peter* himselfe counted this fact of his a piece of zeale, for which hee might be commended.

Thus much was not amisse to produce in behalfe of this conjecture, that what *Peter* did in defence of Christ, hee did as a Zealot; and yet to see, Christ is so farre from approving it, that it incurreth the same reprehension which *James* and *John* before had met with; nay, somewhat a severer, that all might discern how distant the spirit of Zealots was, from that other of Disciples; the Jewish fervour, from the meeknesse of the Gospel: Though the Apostles themselves had not yet perfectly learn'd this truth at Christs death, nor untill the Holy Ghost came to teach them all things, and to bring to their remembrance whatsoever hee had in person being present said unto them.

A plaine mention of these Zealots we find, *Act*. 21. 20. where of some of the Jewes 'tis said, they are all ζηλωταὶ τοῦ νόμου, Zealots of the Law, that were like to be very hot if they saw any thing done to the prejudice of the Law: Of whom therefore Saint *Paul* is adviſed to beware. So of *Paul* himselfe before his conversion, *Act*. 22. 3. 'tis said hee was ζηλωτὴς Θεοῦ, a Zealot of Gods, or in Gods cause; and presently it followes, εἰδὼσα ἄχρι θανάτου, I persecuted to death, &c. for so the Zealots were wont to doe. So *Act*. 17. 5. ζηλωταὶ Ἰουδαῖοι, the Zealots of the Jewes, or, the Jewes inflamed with zeale, (as the old Translation reads it, *Zelantes*, better then the new, *invidia commoti*) of whom 'tis added, ὁχλοποιήσαντες ἐδαρύνον τὸ πόλεον, took unto themselves certain lewd fellowes of the baser sort, and made a tumult, and set all the people in an up-rore. Of which kind Master *Selden* has observed, that *Simon* was one, *Luke*. 6. 15. *Act*. 1. 13. called by Saint *Luke*, Σίμων ζηλωτὴς, *Simon* the Zealot; but by the other Evangelists, Saint *Matthew* and Saint *Marke*, Κανανίτης, or (as *Schindler* and other learned men are bold to mend it) Κανίτης, which we render, the Cananite; but 'tis apparent the word is to be fetcht from the Hebrew קנא, *Canna*, which signifies, Zealot; not from the name of the place: and so is all one with the Greek Ζηλωτὴς, as perfectly the same as Πέτρος and *Cephas*, Δόρκεας and *Tabitha*, and many the like. And thus farre by Scripture light have we past in this digression.

Now what tumults and riots have been wrought by the rude multitude among the Jewes, (or those at least who had no lawfull power in their hand) under the pretence of the privileged of Zealots, no man can be ignorant, who is not wholly unacquainted with *Josephus* story. For in his relation there is nothing more ordinary, then to find all things disturbed by them, the Temple or holy place defiled, μωμισμένοι; ποσὶ, by their prophane feet, to the reproach of
ἁλως:
βιβ: δ.
God:

K. 13.

God; chiefe Priests removed, and others placed in their roome without all respect of bloud, elected by them either according as they pleased, or else by lot; (as it was in the election of one *Phannias* the son of *Samuel* to the high Priesthood) a man, saith *Iosephus*, who ὅς μόνον ἀνάξιος ἀρχιερεὺς, ἀλλ' ὅς ἐπιστάμενος σαφῶς ἢ πότε ἐν ἀρχιερεωσύνῃ δι' ἀγορεύσαν, was not only unworthy to be high Priest, but that did not so much as know what the high Priesthood was, such was his rusticity.

Many passages we find scattered in this Authour, in his books of the Captivity, and large stories of the seditions, and uprores, and massacres, by two sorts of men among the Jewes, the one called Σιχάρριοι, Sword-men or Cutters; (of whom Saint *Luke* makes mention, *Act.* 21. 38. we render them, *Murderers*; and it seemes foure thousand of them got together in a company) the second Ζηλωταί, Zealots; of whom hee makes relations, especially *lib.* 4. c. 11. where hee saith of them, that they killed many of the chiefe men of the Nation, and still when they did so, boasted and bragg'd of themselves, ὡς εὐεργέτας, καὶ σωτῆρας τῆ πόλεως, γεγενημένους, that they were become the benefactors and preservers, or saviours of the City. And by the timidity and baseness of the people concurring with their insolence, advanced so farre, ὡς ἐπ' αὐτοῖς εἶναι καὶ τὰς χειροτονίας τῶ ἀρχιερέων, that they took to themselves the election and constitution of the high Priests. αὐτοὶ γὰρ τὰ γένη ποιοῦσιν, καὶ ἐν κατὰ διαδοχὰς οἱ ἀρχιερεῖς ἀπεδείκνυντο, κατέλασαν δὲ τοὺς ἀγενεῖς, ἐν ἔχουσιν εὐεργετῶν ἀσεβημάτων, and contemning the rules of birth by which the high Priests were to succeed, they constituted ignoble obscure men in those places, that by that means they might have some abettors and partners of their villainies. And *cap.* 12. hee saith, the name of Zealots was of their owne imposing, ὡς ἐπ' ἀγαθοῖς ἐπιτηδεύμασιν, ἀλλ' ὅς ζηλώσαντες τὰ ἁγία, τῶ ἔργων καὶ ὑπερβαλλόμενοι, as if all that they did (*Murders, Sacriledges, Profanations*, before mentioned) were by them done in good intentions, and not, as indeed they were, in emulation, and even to the out-stripping and exceeding the worst actions that had bin recorded. Thus far *Iosephus*.

That these Zealots were a fourth Sect of the Jewes, (added to Sadduces, Pharisees, Essenes) having its originall from *Judas Gaulonita* and *Sadduchus*, is the affirmation of *Bonaventura Cornelius Bertramus*, in the end of his book *De polir. Jud.* A Sect, saith hee, *Judeis ipsis omnibus perniciosissima, ut quæ Judæorum omnium excidium totiusq; reip. Judaicæ prostrationem non modo accelerârit, sed & eam tam miseram & calamitosam effecerit*: A Sect most sadly pernicious to the Jewes themselves; the destruction of all whom, and the prostration of their whole Common-wealth, it did not onely hasten and precipitate, but made it so miserable and calamitous when it came.

Having proceeded thus farre by way of narration, it may chauce to be worth the paines to present unto the Reader a conjecture upon the twelfth verse of the fourth Chap. of the 1 Epistle of Saint *Peter*, Μὴ ζήλοσθε, τῇ ἐν ὑμῖν πυρώσει, The vulgar Latine renders it by words utterly unintelligible: *molite peregrinari in fervore. Beati, ne tanquam peregrini exploratione illa per ignem percellimini*:

as if *ἐνιζέσθαι* signified a strangers being stricken or amazed : and *πύρωσις* triall by fire : which whatsoever it may in some other place, it cannot doe here : because here is added *πρὸς πειρασμὸν γινώμενη* which is beset for your triall, which word would be superfluous, if *πύρωσις* noted triall by fire. The more simple and cleare rendering will be to set the words so, that *πύρωσις* may signifie a combustion, or fire, or burning, (so both the Vulgar and Beza, *Revel. 8. 9.* render *καπνὸν πυρώσεως* *fumum incendi*, and the smoke of her burning) and *ἐνιζέσθαι* may denote these 3 things. 1. To wonder (so the Greeke Scholiast, *ἐνιζέσθαι, θαυμάζειν*) 2. To be affrighted : (so *Tertullian, ne expavesceat*) 3. So as it may be all one with *ἐνοπιάθεν*, to be stricken as with an accident wherewith we are unacquainted. These three senses each, as all of them, may be allowed their places here. Now the conjecture is, that by the *πύρωσις*, the combustion or burning, &c. should be meant, that notable combustion of the Zealots before mentioned, (for indeed the words are of some affinity, the one comming from *πῦρ*, fire, the other from *ζῆλος*, growing fervently hot or burning.) The grounds of the conjecture are these ; 1. Because that last fatall day, the destruction of Jerusalem is spoken of in that very Chap. ver. 7. as that which for some time had been at hand : for I conceive I can make it plaine by comparing of places of the new Test. that *τέλος πάντων* the end of all things is (not the finall period of the world, but) that destruction of Jerusalem or the Jewish Common-wealth, and of that it is said, *ἔγγις*, it is, or hath for some time beene at hand, it was not yet comen : but of this *πύρωσις* or combustion, that it was then *γινώμενη*, already come ; which is directly agreeable to the observation of *Iosephus*, and others conversant in the Jewish, who affirme that that raving and rioting of, (and sad civill combustion wrought by) the Zealots, was antecedent and precursor to the finall destruction of the Jewes by *Titus*. 'Tis affirm'd of this *πύρωσις* that it was *γινώμενη ἐν ὑμῖν*, i. e. among you, in your Land, in the midst of you, (as that phrase frequently signifies in the new Test.) by which is marked out some remarkable thing, which was fallen out among the Jewes, as that time when *Peter* wrote ; to which time that the raving of the Zealots endured, is apparent by mention of them, *Αἱ. 21. 20. Αἱ. 22. 3.* and that by their stirres these Christian Jewes of the *διασπορά* or the dispersion to whom he writes, had beene first scattered abroad, may be conjectured by *Αἱ. 8. 1.* This may suffice for a conjecture, which whether it stand or fall, will not be much concernant to the business which occasioned this *παρεργον*.

To conclude this historickall uneven discourse, I shall onely annex these few animadversions by way of corollary.

1. That this law, or power, or custome, or liberty of Zealots, was never of force but among the Jewes.

2. That the originall and ground of it among them is to be fetcht from hence, that among that people, God immediately presided, and reserved many things to be manag'd and ruled by his peculiar and extraordinary incitation and impulsion, not by any rule of standing publicke law; that so that Common-wealth

might be truly capable of that title which *Josephus* bestowed on it, none of the kinds of humane Governments, but *διοκρατία* the government of God.

3. That it followes not from hence, that all things which were by the Jewes themselves done under pretence of this right, and passed unpunished, were therefore well done; but onely those which were undertaken by men truly incited by God, (such as *Phineez* and *Elias*) for that privilege is not therefore stil'd *zeli privati*, of private zeale, because private men by their owne incitation (*ἰδίᾳ ἐπαλδοῦναι*, as that is opposed to Gods) did what they did; but because they did it without legall processe, or publike judicature. And though I should be so scepticall, as not to dare peremptorily to affirme, that nothing was well done or justifiable in that kinde, but what they did who were truly and immediately incited to it by God; yet should I not be so cowardly as to doubt, but that all those Jewes were so bound to observe those examples of *Phineez* and *Elias*, that if they were not immediately incited by God, yet they should not dare to exceed the limits of those patterns commended by God, either in respect of the manner of doing, or matter of the action. In one of which you shall finde all the examples mentioned in the New Testament, except that of Christ, to have miscarried. And therefore I hope no man will be so unjust to the charitable designe of this Paper, so treacherous to his Readers, so unkinde to his owne Soule, as to borrow from these premises new hints of arguments to susteine a desperate cause by his pretence of zeale; for that would be to extract Rosacre out of Treacle, poyson from that which was designed for antidote. And he must withall resolve, that if the practice of Christ first mentioned, be his president, he must also prescribe to Christs power; or if any of the other New Testament examples, he must be content to fall under their condemnation, for not one of them that I ever yet heard of, was excused by any.

4. That this Sect of Zealots when they thus got together into a body was by the Jewes themselves (among whom the privilege of Zealots was yet in force) taken for the most unlawfull, yea pernicious and fatall, most eminently destructive to that Common-wealth (as appeares by *Josephus* and *Bertram*) and that those things which they did under pretence of law and colour of zeale, were violations of law and meere sacriledge.

5. That all use of this liberty, all imitation of that Jewishe priviledge of Zealots in the Old Testament, is cleerly interdicted all Christians; First, because the written word is the onely Oracle wherein God constantly reveales himselfe to Christians now under the new Testament, neither are any other incitations to be expected from God, but what in the Gospell or New Test. the *διακονία πνεύματος*, the administration of the Spirit (as preaching the Gospell is call'd) doth yeild or afford us; what is more then this, yea, though it come to us from the Pulpit, favours of enthusiasmes and seducing spirits; Secondly, because Christ hath both by his doctrine and example commended to his Disciples all manner of meeknesse (and Saint *Peter*, the meeke and quiet spirit, as most precious in Gods sight under the Gospell, and this a grace most directly contrary to that Spirit

Spirit of Zealots) yea and hath forbidden all private revenge of injuries (done not onely to our selves, but God) referring all to the Magistrate (whom Saint *Paul* calls *Θεὸς δίκαιον ἐκδικῶν ἐς ὀργήν*, *Rom.* 13. 4. the minister of God to execute wrath, or an executioner for wrath) and therefore himselfe meddled not with the woman taken in Adultery; Thirdly, because he interdicted *James* and *John* the use of this power, adding a reprehension, and words emphaticall to this purpose, he turned and rebuked them, saying, *you know not what spirit you are of*; intimating, the Christian spirit to be very distant from that of the Zealots among the Jewes.

I shall adde no more, but my prayer, that as many as have zeale, may have it according to knowledge, and that knowledge, according to the directions of the Gospell.

Of taking up the Crosse.

MAny places of the New Testament there are that require this duty of a Christian, (of which I thinke I may truly say, that 'tis a duty never so much as in kinde required before by God in the Old Testament, nor by the lawes of nature, or Canons of any other Religion, and so a peculiar Christian duty) the chiefe places are these, *Matth.* 16. 24. If any man will come after me, let him deny himselfe and take up his Crosse; &c. and in the same words in the parallel places, *Mark* 8. 34. and *Luk.* 9. 23. So againe, to him who desired to be put in a course by Christ to inherit eternall life, *Mark.* 10. 21. in the close, Come, take up the Crosse, and follow me. In all these places 'tis a duty of plaine command; yet somewhat farther, *Mat.* 10. 38. He that taketh not his Crosse and followeth not after me, is not worthy of me: and in *Luk.* 14. 27. the words are most punctuall, and of unlimited extent, from whence 'twill be hard for any man to obtaine any dispensation, or excuse, *ὅστις ὅ βαρύνει* — whosoever doth not beare his Crosse and come after me, cannot be my Disciple. No man will be exempted from the *ὅστις ὅ* — and no Christian it seemes can be without it; for that is the meaning of [my Disciple,] not onely those peculiar twelve of his, and their successours in the Ministry, for that Relation belongs to them, considered under another notion, as Apostles sent out after by Christ, answerable to the *שליחים* among the Jewes under the Temple, but the disciples are all true followers of Christ, all sincere Christians, and so the doctrine is most plaine, that whosoever doth not beare (which as from those other former places appeares, implies a taking up) the Crosse of Christ, cannot be a true Christian.

Now the *ἀπὸ ταύτης*, taking up the Crosse, will be easily explain'd what it's full importance extends to, the voluntary embracing of shame, continually,

(for the Crosse was a contumelious death *Heb. 12. 2.*) and consequently all other losse of goods, liberty, &c. and beyond that, paine of body and death it selfe: which are said, to be taken up, not when we bring them unnecessarily upon our owne shoulders, (for that is to pull the Crosse upon us) but when by the providence of God they are laid, or permitted to lye in our way to Christ, or Christian obedience, so that we cannot serve Christ perfectly, but it must become detriment or dammage to us, then voluntarily to undergoe that detriment, whatever it is, is to take up the Crosse; and patiently and cheerfully to beare it, is βαρύνειν, to carry or beare the Crosse of Christ, which is the duty, without which a man cannot be a Christian.

There is now one thing to be a little more punctually considered, the strict and neere dependance and connexion betwixt Christianity and the Crosse; and that from the pleasure and providence of God, and dispensation of things under the Gospell, so ordering it generally that we should not serve the Lord our God of that that costs us nothing, but that true Christian piety should bring endurances and sufferings upon us. Thus it is plaine it did to Christ our elder brother; the discharge of the office he had undertaken, brought him to the Crosse, and that Crosse was the onely way to his consecration to the office of high Priest, to which at his resurrection he was inaugurate; *vid. Heb. 2. 10.* it became him, &c. *i. e.* God πολλὰς ὥσ' εἰς δοξάν ἀγαγόντα (not in bringing, but) bringing, (or being about that most gracious and mighty designe of bringing) many sonnes unto glory, ἡ ἀρχὴ τῆς σωτηρίας αὐτῶν διὰ παθημάτων τελειώσαι by sufferings to consecrate or inaugurate, (for so τελειῶν critically signifies, being the word solemnly used by the Septuagint to signifie the legall consecration of the Priests under the Law) the captaine of our salvation, that is Christ, who τελειωθείς, being so consecrated, became the author of eternall salvation, &c. *Heb. 5. 9.* From hence, without more places it would follow, that we Christians are to expect our τελείωσις (whether consecration to our βασιλείαν ἐν ἁγίῳ our dignity of being Kings and Priests, *i. e.* Christians here; or consummation and crowning hereafter, as τελείωσις also signifies (τελείωσις ἀληθινῆ. *Nyff.*) by the same method and means that our captaine had his, which is διὰ παθημάτων by sufferings: which course of divine Oeconomy is so generall and without exception, (2 *Tim.* 3. 12. yea, and all that will be godly in this world, διαχθήσονται, shall be persecuted) that *Heb. 12. 6, 7, 8.* the words are very remarkeable, Whom God loveth, he chastneth, and scourgeth every sonne whom he receiveth, if you endure chastning, God dealeth with you as with sonnes, for what sonne is he whom the father chastneth not? But if you be without chastisement whereof all are partakers, then are you bastards, and not sonnes. Words of a large unlimited latitude, which I cannot discern any way in the world to soften, so as they may be supportable to him, that (as the Psalmist saith) hath no changes, hath enjoyed an age of an uninterrupted continued prosperity, without ever having the Crosse on his shoulders. I confesse I would faine finde out some μαλακτικὸν or mollifying distinction, as that of the ἀνίμην μαρτυρίαν, the prepa-

ration to suffer, though God never send occasion, that that might suffice for his qualification, who hath no other, but sure that will not be able to allay or take off the force of [and chasteneth every sonne, &c.] and if yee be without, not onely if you be not prepared to beare, but if you be without chastisement, then are you bastards, &c. which when it is set downe as an aphorisme of divine observation under the Kingdome of Christ, an Axiome of Gods Gospell-providence, there will be no safety in disputing or labouring to avoyd the literall importance of it. To that purpose I conceive those words tend *Rom. 8. 28.* where to prove the conclusion premised, *vers. 28.* that all things tend to the good of them that love God, (and what those *all things* are, is specified, *vers. 35.* tribulation, distresse, persecution, famine, nakednesse, danger, sword,) the Apostle thus argues : From whom he hath foreknown, *i. e.* fore-appointed, the lovers of God premised, those he hath also predestin'd to be conformable to to the image of his Sonne, *i. e.* in suffering; and whom hee hath predestined, those he hath also called; to wit, to that conformity to which he hath predestined them, (as *1 Pet. 2. 21.* the phrase is used, *εις τὸ τοῦ κυρίου ἐκκλησίου*, for to this ye were called, *i. e.* to this suffering as Christ did, and *c. 3. 9.* ye are thereunto called, that you should inherit *κληρονομία*, blessing (not as we render it, a blessing) *i. e.* that yee should blesse enemies as Christ did, and so inherit that exemplary grace of his, which as a grace may as properly be said to be inherited; thus the context seemes to inforce it [not rendring evill for evill, but blessing, knowing that you are thereunto called, that you should inherit blessing, &c. *i. e.* possesse that grace after him, so eminently discernible in him.] And whom hee hath thus called, he justified and glorified. Where the first and second proposition must be acknowledged universall, that all whom he hath foreknowne, all lovers of God, are thus predestined, and all that are predestined, called (by their very title or profession of Christians) to this conformity with Christ in sufferings. Adde to these *1 Pet. 4. 18.* if the righteous hardly be saved; which must be understood by the sense of the Hebrew phrase, *Prov. 11. 30.* rendred by the *72.* *Εὐδαιμονος μόλις σωθήσεται*, and here retained by Saint *Peter*, and then the sense will be [and if the righteous be recompenced, *i. e.* by an *Hebraisme*, punished in the earth, &c. or more literally to the Greeke, If he escape hardly or with difficulty.] (as *1 Cor. 3. 15.* *ζημιωθήσεται σωθήσεται δὲ*, he shall be mulcted or suffer losse, but shall escape) which interpretation the former verse in Saint *Peter*, confirms [*ὅτι ὁ καιρὸς ἔσται ἀρχῆς τοῦ ἡμέρα ἀπὸ τοῦ θεοῦ*] for it is the season of that act of divine dispensation, *viz.* of judgements beginning from the house of God, *i. e.* of Gods inflicting judgements of this life (which are the beginning or first part (*τὸ πρῶτον* as it followes) of Gods retribution for sinne) on the Godly] which signifies that the state of the Gospell, is that season, though the Law was not: and to the same purpose, the verse following also, *ὡς πάντες κατὰ τὸ θέλημα τοῦ θεοῦ* &c. They that suffer according to the will of God, It seemes by all put together, that the *μόλις σωθήσεται* [scarcely saved] is spoken of suffering, and the will or providence of God is that that

disposes it so, and so the conclusion from thence is cleare, and universall. The righteous shall be punished in the earth. 'Tis true indeed, under the Old-Testament we finde not any such oeconomy, but promises of a long and happy life, in a temporall *Canaan* to the obedient servants of God, (though sometimes, God was pleased to interpose some variety in this kind, many troubles of the righteous in *David's* time) but under the Gospell 'tis quite contrary, even those duties which are promised a reward on this earth, as mercifulnesse or almesgiving, are yet to expect the payment of this reward with some mixture (like *Homer's* good cup powred out alwayes, with a dash of the bad) the hundred-fold which such men are promised to receive *οὐ τῷ καρπῷ τῷ τῷ* - in this time, this first inferior harvest of retributions, though they be secular blessings, houses, and lands, &c. yet must they be with persecutions, *Mark. 10. 30.* Which particular though neither *S. Matthew* nor *S. Luke* records, yet *S. Peter* (who had most reason punctually to observe those words of Christ, being an answer directed to a question of his proposing, as all the three Evangelists acknowledge) remembered them, and so we finde them in *S. Markes* Gospell, which is resolved to have been dictated by *Saint Peter*.

Having thus farre in the passage briefly pointed at this piece of Gospell-Providence, 'twill not be amisse as briefly to guesse at the ends of this divine Oeconomy. 1. To administer occasion of the practice and exercise of many Christian duties, and graces, as of patience, meeknesse, waiting on Christ, of loving our enemies, of the *μὴ ἀντιστῆναι τῷ πονηρῷ* the non-resisting evil, we render it, or not using any violence against him that molests us, (rendring [*τῷ πονηρῷ*] of the Person, &c.) which if we have in seed or habit, 'tis certainly a great felicity to us, to meet with opportunities to actuate them, both in respect of the evidencing the sincerity of them to God, to our brethren, to our own soules; and in respect of that reward, or Crowne promised, the great degree of glory, *Math. 5. 12.* that is proportioned to the *τὸ ἔργον* according to his worke, *Psal. 62. 12. 2 Cor. 5. 10. ἵνα κομισθῶμεν ἀπὸς αὐτοῦ* according to the nature and number of the Acts, or operations of those gifts or graces, as on the other side, a greater portion of the Torments of hell is allotted to the more multiplied acts of wilfull sinne. 2 To helpe to mortifie any remainders of sinne in us, which by continued prosperity are ready and apt to take root, and flourish in us. 3 To assimilate, or make us like to Christ, to conforme us to the image of his son, *Rom. 8. 29.* that is the image of the crucified Saviour, as was said, that he might be the first borne of many brethren, that is, might have a Church or family, a multitude of brethren like himselfe, all sufferers as he was. 4 That our sins being punished here, there might remain no arreare to be paid in another world; having had all our Purgatory here, there might remain nothing but heaven hereafter; which the Apostle expresseth *1 Cor. 11. 32.* We are chastened of the Lord, that we should not be condemned with the World: to which Father *Abraham* referres *Luke 16. 25. Lazarus* received his evil things in this life time, and now he is comforted.

These and such like being the designes of this act of Gods Gospell-Providence; It is next observable what a character the Spirit of God sets upon the Crosse, i.e. Tribulation or affliction here, that it is the happiest, blesseddest estate, the most comfortable joyfull condition that a Christian can meete with. This riddle and paradox, or prodigy to carnall reason, is become the most ordinary beaten acknowledged truth in the new Testament. 'Tis the close of the beatitudes, in that institution of Christians, the Sermon in the mount, *Matth. 5. 10.* Blessed are they that are persecuted, and *vers. 11.* reviled: and the exhortation in this case *χαίετε & αγαλλιᾶσθε* rejoyce, and be exceeding glad, so *Luke 6. 22.* (which there is some reason to thinke was spoken by Christ at another time) blessed are you when men shall hate you, and separate you, and reproach you, and cast you out, &c. *χαίετε & σιγήσατε*, rejoyce ye in that day, and leape for joy, &c. Saint *Paul* had learnt this, *Col. 1. 24.* who now rejoyce in my sufferings, yea, and glory too. *2 Cor. 11. 30. 12. 5. 9.* Saint *James* his exhortation is remarkable in the front of his *Ep. 1. 2.* My brethren, count it all joy when ye fall into divers Temptations, *πάντα χαρὰν*, all joy; i.e. The most joyous accident possible, and *vers. 12.* blessed is the man that endureth Temptation, &c. & *cap 5. 11.* ἴδ' μακαρίζομεν τῶς ἐπειθείσας, behold we count them happy, wee render it; it signifies more; behold we account them as a kinde of Saints in Heaven, (for so *δὲ μακάρι* usually signifies) and *Aristotle* speaking of some heroicall super-humane excellencies, *ἐκ ἱπανθῆμεν*, saith he, ἀλλὰ μακαρίζομεν) it seemes that of suffering, a most blessed condition. To these adde Saint *Peter, 1. Ep. 3. 15.* but sanctifie the Lord God in your hearts; where the word *ἀγιάζων* is to sanctifie, as that is all one with glorifying, or hallowing, or praising; a consequent of the generall rule, *verse 14.* if ye suffer for righteousness sake, happy are yee; and perfectly opposite to [being afraid of their terror, and being troubled,] in the end of that *vers.* and so is an expression of this duty of praising, thanking, blessing God for our sufferings in this life. So againe, *1 Ep. 4. 13.* μὴ ἐντρέσθε, *vers. 12.* be not frighted or stricken, &c. but rejoyce in as much as you are partakers of Christs sufferings, and *vers. 14.* If yee be reproached for the name of Christ, happy are you, &c. and *vers. 16.* If any suffer as a Christian (not as a murtherer, a thiefe, an evill doer, a busie-body in other mens matters, *vers. 15.* no great joy or comfort in any of those sufferings) let him not be ashamed but let him glorifie God on this behalfe, *ὅτι δὲ καὶ οὗτος ἔργαται τὸ κρῖμα*, that it is the season for judgement to begin, or of judgements beginning, at the house of God, as hath beene explained, 'tis seasonable that the *τὸ πρῶτον*, the first part of Gods ἀνταπόδοσι; retribution to sinne, that which is in this life, should befall the house of God, Christians, and the most obedient of them; and being so, this is matter of rejoycing, and glorifying God. Other places ye will observe easily to the same purpose, let these for the present suffice, to soften this carnall paradox.

But now having proceeded thus far in a matter, to him that is conversant in the new Testament, so obvious and vulgar, that I shall presume it matter of wonder.

der to him, what should move me to so superfluous and unnecessary an undertaking; I must now take confidence to proceed to that which *Arrian* calls the *ἐπαρμογή* *πρὸς τὰς ἐν μέσῃ τοῖς ἀνθρώποις*, the applying of *κενὰ ἡθροῖα* known and granted principles, to particular persons, or cases, or practices. For therein as that excellent Philosopher observes, consists the ground and beginning of all strife and difficulty, and difference betwixt men; no man having any considerable Temptation, to keep him from consenting to the truth of a generall proposition sufficiently asert, as long as he appeares not concern'd in it, and yet every man almost having some irreconcilable quarrell to it, when his actions are required to be ruled by it; hence is it, that the speculative part of knowledge, is farre easier then the practicall; and as *Aristotle* saith, the Mathematicks which are the most abstruse Science, are most easie to be learnt by a young man, or a dissolute, of any the most untamed affections, so he have but an ordinary naturall capacity, (and 'tis evident by his *Organon*, that he supposed children to have learnt Geometry before they came to Logicke) whereas of the precepts of Morality, such are utterly incapable *λέγουσι ὅτι πιστεύουσι*: they can recite them by rote, but beleve not a word of them.

I wish it were now uncharitable to affirme the same, of many that have taken upon them, to be the best, and most reforming Christians amongst us; that it continued still to be but our jealousie, what is now proved our sense, that some of those who have hitherto been admired for our strictest Christians, have at length confest themselves farthest from the merit, and true desert of that title, if the doctrine of the crosse which hitherto we have laid down for acknowledged truth, doe not at last prove a fable.

The Apostle *Phil.* 3. 18. tells us even weeping, that there are many walkers, (I think he means by that phrase *πολλοὶ περιπατοῦσι*, Christian professors) whom judging by their actions, he cannot chuse but call *ἐχθροὺς ὅτι σαυρὸν ὁ χρῖσθ*, (of whom it seemes he had oft admonished them, *εἰλεον πολλὰκις καὶ ἰὺν λέγω*) enemies of the Crosse of Christ; what those were in the Apostles time will not be pertinent now to examine, I shall onely with a sad heart (not desiring to judge my brother, but if it were possible, to direct him to prejudice, or at least examine himselfe, and so either anticipate and prevent, or else prepare himselfe to approach with confidence Gods judgement, and withall, to helpe undeceive others whom we finde ductile to some moderne innes, much-what upon that dangerous prepossession which the Apostle calls having mens persons in admiration) make these few quare's, and leave every mans owne soule to answer them.

1. Supposing our grounds layd to be true, I demand whether it be the temper of a true Christian, and not rather of an enemy of the Crosse of Christ, instead of rejoycing, to repine and murmur under the Crosse, and evidence that by speaking evill of those powers who have layd it on our shoulders?

2. To be more refractory after such sufferings, (instead of being more meek and more humble) more violent in matters of indifferency, (by our own continued

tinued practice acknowledged to be so in our account, till after such sufferings our judgements or rather our practice altered) and more resolv'd not to yeeld obedience in them, then before we thought our selves bound to be.

3. To plot and project, and to that purpose to hold correspondence with other men, (whom we conceive already moved with discontents, or our selves have labour'd to move) to find out the most probable way of delivering us from the Crosse, whatsoever that way be, beside our addresss to God in prayer to remove it, if he see it best for us in all respects.

4. To make use of any means to this purpose, which wee are not assured is administred and offered unto us by God, of which wee can no way possibly be assured, but by the evident goodnesse and justifiableness, at least, lawfulness in all respects of that meanes which we thus designe to make use of.

5. To move or stirre the quiet and peace of one or more Kingdoms, (though not principally, yet collaterally, or at all) in this contemplation, that we shall get the Crosse off from our own shoulders, come to a more prosperous condition, yea, though it be but to a more peaceable enjoying of our manner of Religion, then hitherto we have attained to.

6. To venture on, and (though not primarily to designe, if it may be done without it, yet if it may not, then secondarily and consequently) to resolve on the shedding of any one mans blood, which wee know would not otherwise be shed, especially if it proceed further, to the waging or but occasioning of a warre, in which (whether offensive or defensive on our parts) it cannot be hoped but a great effusion of Christian and Protestant blood will follow.

7. To attempt or desire the removing of the Land-marks, the altering of the Government of Church and State, the working of any considerable change in either, (which wee can have no revelation to assure us may not prove authour of some inconvenience which wee fore-see not) the better to secure our selves or others, that the Crosse shall not returne to our shoulders again.

8. To thinke it just and reasonable (and our selves injur'd if it be not so) that wee should have the greater portion of secular dignities for the future, in regard of some former sufferings of ours; which if it should befall us, would be parallel to that curse, *Mat. 6. mercedem habent*, they have their reward, in this life.

9. To endeavour to lay this Crosse on other mens shoulders, of which wee have freed our own, whether those other men be such as were not guilty of our former sufferings, but perhaps pitied and mourned, and prayed for us, (for that were rewarding good with evill) or whether they be our greatest persecuters, (for that will be rendring evill for evill) most perfectly contrary to Christs doctrine, *Mat. 6. 44. Rom. 12. 17, 19, 20, 21.*

Secondly, supposing things to be as now they are in this Kingdome, my Question is, First, Whether we have no great reason to beleieve, that (the doctrine of the Crosse being not so well laid to heart by those who three yeares since conceived themselves the principall Schollers in that Schoole) God is now

pleased to call another sort of men into that forme, to try whether they will prove better proficients then their predecessours have done. Secondly, Whether those on whom that lot is now fallne, be not most eminently bound to glorifie God in this behalfe, 1 Pet. 4. 16. Thirdly, Whether by the experience of other mens failings in this kind, they have not reason to be earnest in prayer to God, and diligent in using and improving all Gods directions, for the due Christian discharging of so glorious, and withall, so difficult a task; that when they are proved to the utmost, are brought forth to resist to bloud, they may be found faithfull. Fourthly, Whether the obtaining of this grace from God be not more highly conducibile to every mans owne individuall interests, then the removing of the Crosse from us, though wrought most directly, and by means administred undoubtedly by God himselfe. Fifthly, Whether it can become a Christian to make use of any meanes which he is not on sure grounds satisfied to be purely and perfectly lawfull (i.e. agreeable first to the Gospel-rule of obedience to Christ in every particular, and second to the lawfull commands of our undoubted Superiours, not contradicted by any law or power higher then they) to get now either totally or in part from this Crosse, i.e. from any pressure which in the discharge of a good conscience God shall permit to fall on any of us.

When every man in this broken State and Church, most sadly militant, of what persuasions soever hee be, hath laid the severall parts of these two Queries to his heart, and examined himselfe by them, (which truly I should not have laid thus plainly before him, had I had any other thought or aime, but this one of making it impossible for him to be blinde in judging himselfe) I shall hope hee will pardon his Monitor, and save this paper the labour of proceeding further to beare witnesse against him at any other tribunall then this of his owne conscience.

*The Lord prosper this short discourse to the end
to which it is designed.*



A Vindication of Christs reprehending Saint Peter, from the Exceptions of Master Marshall.



Here is nothing more unjust and uningenuous, then Master Marshall's dealing about Christs reprehension of Saint Peter's using the Sword; whilst hee labours to answer the Objection, which from thence is brought against the use of Armes, though but defensive, taken up against a lawfull Magistrate. The Argument is briefly this: Saint Peter, in defence of his Master (Christ himselfe) drew his Sword, and

Vid. supra
Pag. 7.

cut off the Eare of *Malchus*, one of the High Priests Servants, sent by Commission from their Masters, to apprehend Jesus: and our Saviour commands him to put up his Sword; adding by way of reason, *for they that take the sword (take it not when 'tis put into their hands by God, or the supreme Magistrate, or any Delegate of his, who hath the power of the Sword; but take it, usurpe it, without legall authority or concession, giving or permitting it to them) shall perish by the sword.* Which reason, or backing of Christs reprehension, is brought to inferre, That 'tis a sinne for any to use the Sword against the supreme Magistrate, though for defence of Christ, or Christian Religion. To this Master Marshall's Answer is three-fold: 1. *That the speech of Christ to Peter, is not a reproofe of the sword taken for a just defence; but of the sword taken for unjust oppression, and a comfort to those who are oppressed with it. For Origen, Theophylact, Titus, Euthymius, interpret the meaning to be, that Christ doth not rebuke Peter for using defensive Armes; but to let Peter know, that hee need not snatch Gods works out of his hands; for God would in time punish those with the sword, that came thus with the sword against him. And that these words are a prophecy of the punishment which the Roman sword should exact of the bloody Jewish nation, according with the like expression, Revel. 13. 10. Hee that kills with the sword, must be killed with the sword: here is the patience and faith of the Saints; i.e. this may comfort the Saints in their persecutions, that God will take vengeance for them:*

and for all this, the Margine advises the Reader to consult *Grotius de jure belli*, l. 1. c. 3. m. 3. This is the place at length in Master *Marshall* his Letter to a friend, which (being of some concernment and importance to the present controversy of the times, though not to confirme his cause by this exposition, yet to dispatch one of his speciall adversaries out of the way) I shall now beg leave to examine; and of all together, observe these foure things: First, that the ancient Writers, vouched by him, are not vouched from his owne reading, but taken upon trust from *Grotius*, as also the observation of the Roman Sword, and the place in the *Revelations*. Secondly, that the interpretation, asserted by him out of them, is not asserted by them. Thirdly, that it is not asserted by *Grotius*. Fourthly, that *Grotius*, to whom hee owes all this seeming aid to his cause, is the most declared enemy of this whole cause of his, in behalfe of defensive resistance of the Magistrate, that hee could possibly have false on; and upon occasion of these words of Christ to *Peter*, hath said as much against it. If these foure things be made good, I cannot guesse what could be further added, to prove the injustice and uningenuoufnesse, I shall adde, the untowardnesse and unluckinesse of this Answer. And for the particulars, I shall but require a Reader with eyes in his head, and suppose him not possit with a beliefe of an absolute infallibility in Master *Marshall*, and then I shall be confident to demonstrate them.

For the first, the prooffe will be short, if you please but to look on *Grotius* in the place directed to in his Annotations on the Gospels, pag. 465. almost verbatim transcribing what hee had before published *de jure belli*; you shall in each find every of the particulars mentioned: but for this I would not charge Master *Marshall*, I wish hee would alwayes gleane out of so good Writers. The onely fault here is, that having borrowed so much from him, and digested it into nourishment of his owne error, hee did not also take the paines to borrow what was present to be had, a most soveraigne antidote for his owne poyson, meanes of rectifying his mistake: but like the man in *Gellius*, that had eat so much poyson, and therewith so invenom'd his bloud, that hee could poyson the Flea that came to bite him: so, hee the *Grotius*, that came to prick and wound; or, if hee had pleased, to convert, to bring him to repentance.

For the second, I shall not expect to evince it against so great an authority of Master *Marshall*, without transcribing the very words of those Writers in this matter. *Origen* upon the place in *Mat. 26. v. 35. p. 118.* explains the whole period in these words, (I shall omit no word that is pertinent to the matter in hand:) *Unus eorum qui erant cum Jesu, nondum manifestè concipiens apud se Evangelicam patientiam illam traditam sibi à Christo, nec pacem quam dedit discipulis suis, sed secundum potestatem datam Judæis per legem de inimicis, extendens manum accepit gladium, &c.* *Peter* it seemes had not perfectly learned the doctrine of Christian patience, and the peace which Christ commended to his Disciples, but proceeded according to the Jewish Law of dealing

dueling with enemies. This concludes *Peter's* act contrary to Christian patience and peaceableness, and so makes him capable of Christs reproofe, which *Master Marshall* will wholly divert from him, and cast upon the Jewes. Then hee goes on, *Mox Jesus ad eum, converte gladium in locum suum: Est ergo gladii locus aliquis, ex quo non licet excipere eum, qui non vult perire maxime in gladio.* (This clearly of *Saint Peter* againe, and not the Jewes, that hee must not take the sword out of its place, unlesse hee will be content to perish by the sword:) *Pacificos enim vult esse Jesus discipulos suos, ut bellicum gladium hunc deponentes,* (O that *Master Marshall* would remember this; and after so faire an admonition, put the military sword out of his mouth also.) *Alterum pontificium accipiant gladium, quem dicit Scriptura gladium Spiritus. Simile autem mihi videtur quod dicit, Omnes qui accipiunt, &c. i.e. omnes qui non pacifici, sed belli concitatores sunt, in eo bello peribunt quod concitant, &c. Et puto quod omnes tumultuosi & concitatores bellicorum, & conturbantes animas hominum, maxime Ecclesiarum, accipiunt gladium, in quo & ipsi peribunt.* Excellent seasonable doctrine for these times, if it might be laid to heart; but no way excusing *Saint Peter*. Againe, *Qui accipiunt gladium, &c. cavere nos convenit, ut ne occasione militie, vel vindictae propriarum injuriarum* (remember, not for revenge of ones owne injuries) *exinamini gladium, aut ob aliquam occasionem, quam omnem abominatur hac Christi doctrina, precipiens ut impleamus quod scriptum est, Cum his qui odierunt pacem, eram pacificus. Si ergo cum odientibus pacem debemus esse pacifici, adversus neminem gladio uti debemus.* These are the words of *Origen*; out of which, he that shall inferre that *Origen* conceived the meaning of the Scripture to be, that Christ did not rebuke *Peter* for using defensive Armes against *Malchus*, I shall resolve, he hath gotten the Philosophers stone, is Alchymist enough to extract fire out of water; any the most contrary sense out of any words. Not so much as one word here of the Jewes or the Roman sword that should give them their payment; but all of *Peter's* sword, and the miscarriages of that. And so much for *Origen*.

What if a
man should
construe
this (not an
occasion of
the Militie

Then for *Theophylact*; hee is also punctuall enough to this purpose: *Μη ἐγκαλέμεν τὸν Πέτρον, ὅτι ἔχρησεν ὡς μάχης ἐκείνου, ἀλλ' ὡς ἐκείνου τοῦ διδασκάλου ζηλώσας τὸ τοιοῦτον.* *Let us not find fault with Peter, (make not too much haste Master Marshall to catch that, till you see the consequents) for hee did this not for himselfe, but in zeale for his Master.* Herein I shall interpose my conjecture, that *Theophylact* might think *Peter* did this, as a Zealot; as *James* and *John* would have destroyed the Village of the Samaritans, *jure Zelotarum*: so his words also found on *Luke*, pag. 518. *Ζηλοῦσι μαχητὰ καὶ μαχηταὶ ἀνασύρονται:* and then thought that were unlawfull for a Christian, a piece of Judaisme outdated by Christ; yet in *Peter*, as a Jew, not perfectly illuminate, or instructed in the Christian doctrine, (as *Origen* before observ'd) it was not so blameable yet, till after the coming of the Holy Ghost, who was to bring all things to their remembrance which Christ had taught them. And therefore perhaps it is,

In Matthew
p. 161.

that, although Saint *Augustine* calls this of *Peter*, *carnalem amorem*; yet, *animum Magistri* still. The same Authour upon Saint *Marke* hath these words, upon this same occasion, Ἀποσιωπᾷ τὸ ἥτομα ὁ Μάρκος, ἵνα μὴ εἰδῇ ἐπαυγῆναι τὸ διδάσκαλον αὐτοῦ Πέτρον, ὡς ἐκλήσασθαι ὑπὲρ Χρίστου. Counting this zeale, as in a Jew, rather a commendable thing. If all this be yeilded, yet will it be no justification of the like in a Christian; because now Christ hath reformed that law, and checkt that *Peter*. And therefore, the same *Theophylact* goes on; that though wee should not aggravate *Peter's* fault, nor chide him for it, ὁ δὲ Κύριος μεταρρυθμίζων αὐτὸν εἰς ἐυαγγελικὴν πολιτείαν διδάσκει μὴ κρῖναι μαχαίρᾳ, καὶ τὸ θεὸν δοκῇ τις ἐκδικεῖν yet Christ reformes him, turnes him to the Gospel-discipline, and teaches him not to use the sword, though by so doing hee seems to defend or vindicate God himselfe. Could any man have spoken more expressly or prophetically against Master *Marshall* his doctrine, then this father doth. (So likewise in other places upon Saint *Lukes* Gospel, pag. 518. Ζηλοῖσι δ' οἱ μωδισταί, &c. ὁπιμῶτα δὲ ὁ δῆμος Πέδρος ὡς παρὰ τὸ σκόπῳ τῷ Κυρίῳ ζήλω χρησάμενος: hee confesses *Peter* was chid for his zeale. And on Saint *John's* Gospel, Ἄν' ὁ Κυρίος χετασάμει μιν τὸ Πίττον, καὶ ἀπειλάσας, βόλας, φησι, &c. The Lord reprehends *Peter*, and threatening, saith, put up, &c. threatening whom? sure that person, in *Theophylact's* opinion, to whom hee said, put up: and that sure was *Peter*, not the Jewes.) But to shew you the occasion of Master *Marshall's* mistake: It followes indeed in *Theophylact* on *Matthew*, Ἀντίτετα δὲ ὅτι διὰ τὸ Ῥωμαίων μαχαίρᾳ ἀναρτηθήσονται οἱ καὶ αὐτὸ λαβόντες τὴν μαχαίραν ἰερέων. Insinuat autem, as *Oecolampadius* renders it: Christ insinuates that by the Romans sword, the Jewes that too: the sword against him, shall be destroyed. This acknowledged truth, (that the Romans should destroy the Jewes, the apprehenders and crucifiers of Christ, i.e. that were guilty of crucifying him,) was, saith hee, insinuated in those words of Christ, wherein, as before wee shewed out of *Theophylact's* words, hee reproved Saint *Peter*. Now wee know that ἀντίτετα, or insinuating, or intimating, signifies a secundary or allegoricall sense of a Scripture, as it is frequent in that Authour. Speaking of the cutting off *Malchus* his Eare, ἀντίτετα γὰρ, saith hee, hee insinuates, ὅτι παρῆκοι ἦσαν καὶ ἀπειθεῖς, that the Jewes d d not beare and obey the Scripture, as they should: a meere allegoricall interpretation. So when Christ bids him that had no sword, sell his garment and buy one, Luk. 22.36. πολέμους ἀντίτετα, &c. hee speaks anigmatically; and tells them by way of insinuation, what warres and dangers should betide them. Which insinuated or anigmaticall sense, though it be acknowledged true, will not evacuate that other literall. For I hope, in Master *Marshall* his owne judgement, that 'tis lawfull to use a sword in ones owne defence, in time of warre and danger, and that that lawfulness is authorized by Christ, in those words: which I shall not doubt to acknowledge with him, if it be not against the lawfull Magistrate.

The product then of *Theophylact's* interpretation will be this; that by those words, (for all they that take the sword, shall perish by the sword) Christ reprehends

reprehends and chides *Peter* for drawing his sword, and using it, as hee did: and withall, insinuates enigmathically the destruction of the Jewes by the Romans. Which if it be acknowledged true in both senses, 'twill no way prejudice us, or serve Master *Marshall*, whose cause depends upon rejecting of the former sense, not on asserting the latter: and doth not onely affirme, that it is a reproofe of the sword taken for unjust oppression, but also that it is not a reproofe of the sword taken for just defence: which is absolutely false in *Theophylact's* opinion, if defending of Christ be just defence, or chiding be reproving; or if teaching not to use the sword, though one seeme to defend God himselfe, be rebuking *Peter* for using defensive Armes for Christ. The short is, though *Theophylact's* interpretation bring the Jewes under Christs threatening and reprehension, yet doth it no way free *Peter* from the same; but primarily subjects him to it: The contrary to which is the onely thing would be for Master *Marshall* his purpose. 'Tis true indeed, in his *Scholia* on Saint *John*, hee saith, *Christ comforted Peter*, which seemes opposite to rebuking; but that was not in those words, *For they that take the sword, &c.* but in those, *the cup, &c.* (παράμειπται δὲ ἐν ᾧ εἶπὼν τὸ ποτήριον, &c.) which Saint *John* immediatly adds, omitting the words of the threatening out of the law. And so much for *Theophylact* also.

Now that which hath been thus largely set down out of *Theophylact*, will sufficiently cleare this whole business, without proceeding to examine what may be found in *Titus Bostrensis*, or *Euthymius*, to this purpose. The former of these, in his Exposition of Saint *Luke*, in the *Bibliotheca patrum Græc.* hath not the least word sounding that way, but rather contrary; interpreting Christs command of buying a sword, as a designation onely of the Jewes preparation against him, καὶ ὅτι μέλλουσιν αὐτὸν συλλαμβάνειν, and that they were about to apprehend him: which (as *Theophylact* did, so) hee calls, αἰνύμα μαχίρας, the intimation of the sword; and saith, that therefore Christ adds, that the things written of him must be fulfilled. And againe, that if Christ would have had his Disciples use any humane help at his apprehension, a hundred swords would not have been sufficient, ἐν δὲ μὴ τούτοις, καὶ αἱ δύο περιτταὶ, and if hee would not, even these two would be too many. But all this hee saith upon the passage of the two swords. The truth is, in the Exposition of the Gospel, hee saith nothing of this reprehension of *Peter*, but passes it over in silence. And for his notes on Saint *Matthew*, as also for *Euthymius* his, though, I confesse, that I have them not by me, yet (besides that I find nothing that way in those *Excerpta* that *Lucas Burgenfis* hath out of them, who would not probably have omitted the mention of such a rarity, if it were there,) I thinke I may take upon me at a venture to say, that hee that examines those bookes, shall not possibly meet with more then out of *Theophylact* was cited: These three Expositors running generally on the same notions, and all of them for the most part gleaning from *Chrysostome*, (*Euthymius* being his Scholler, *Titus* his profest Epitomater) who I am sure hath nothing in favour of this

Exposition

Exposition. Out of him, as the *Homer* of those after-Expositors, I shall transcribe these few passages, *αὐτὸς δέειν*, in his homil. 34. on *Mat. c. 26*. Why did hee bid buy a Sword? to give them assurance that hee should be betray'd: *ὅχι ἵνα ὀπλισανται, (ἀπαραι) ἀλλὰ ᾧ παράδοσιν δειλῶν*. Not that they should be armed on that occasion, (away with that) but to signifie his betraying. Then, that their having those two weapons at that time, was upon occasion of killing the lambe for the Paskeover, and the Disciples then coming from Supper, and hearing that some would come to apprehend him, took them out from thence with them, *ὡς πολέμους ὑπὲρ τοῦ διδασχάλου*, meaning to fight for their Master; *ὁ δὲ ἐκείνων γνώμης ἦν μόνον*, which was their opinion onely, not Christs intention: *διὰ ὀπτιμάτων ὁ Πέτρος αὐτῇ χρησάμενος*, wherefore *Peter* is chid for using of it: *καὶ μὴ σφοδρῶς ἀπειλῆς*, and that with a sound threat; which what can it be, but that about which wee now contend, *they that take the sword, &c.* upon the hearing of which words, saith hee, hee straight obeyed, and did so no more. Againe, citing the passage in Saint *Luke*, *τῷ μαθητῇ ἐπιτίμησε καὶ ἀπειλῆσει ἵνα πείσῃ*, hee chid and threatned the Disciples into obedience; and then sets down the words of the threat, *πάντες γὰρ, &c.* for all that take, &c. And yet after all these plaine words of reprehending and threatening *Peter*, in those words (*all they that take the sword, shall perish by it*) hee yet adds, that hee comforted his Disciples by two things, first the punishment of the betrayers, applying to that the same speech in a Parenthesis (*They that take, &c.*) and that hee suffered not unwillingly. All which together signifie clearly the same that wee found in *Theophylact*, (and presume the utmost either of *Titus* or *Enthymius* their exposition) that in that threatening of *Peter*, is intimated also or insinuated anigmatically a threat of those other Sword-men that came out with swords and staves to take *Jesus*: which will not be denied by any, or disputed of by me, so the other be granted, *viz.* that *Peter* was here reprehended and threatned; which is the onely thing we quarrell in *Mr. Marshall*. And so much for the second under-taking.

Now that, in the third place, *Grotius* himselfe who cites these foure Ancients, and is here cited by Master *Marshall*, *de jure belli, l. 1. c. 3. n. 3.* doth not in this place, or any other of his writings, assert this interpretation, I shall thus prove: The thing that in that place hee hath in hand is to enquire, Whether all use of the sword, for a mans owne defence, be unlawfull under the Gospel? And hee resolves, that in case of one private mans being invaded by another, 'tis lawfull by the law of Christ, (not necessary, but lawfull; a man is onely not obliged to the contrary) or notwithstanding the prescribed rules of Christian patience, to kill another in defence of my owne life. Against this, three objections hee mentions out of the New Testament, *Mat. 5. 39. Rom. 12. 19.* and the saying of Christ to *Peter*, *Put up thy sword, &c. For all they that take the sword, &c.* To those three hee answers:

1. By opposing some other places of Scripture; that of Christ to his followers, *Luk. 22. 36.* that to buy a sword, they should sell a coat. In which company

pany of his auditors there were, saith hee, at that time none but his Disciples ; and although, saith hee, it be a proverbiall speech, signifying the great dangers approaching, yet it referr'd to the ordinary use of swords at that time, for private mens defence in time of danger, not there prohibited by him : applying that of Cicero, *Gladios habere certè non liceret, si uni illis nullo pacto liceret* : Wee might not be allowed to have swords, if it were in no case lawfull to use them. Which still confirms his point in hand, that in some case, the use of the private sword is lawfull.

2. Hee proceeds to the particular places, saith, in the *μὴ ἀντιστάτω τῷ πολεμῶντι*, there is some exception allowed, that it binds onely in tolerable injuries ; such as the box on the cheek, &c. there mentioned : in the *μὴ ἐκδίκῃς τὸν ταυρὸν*, *ἐκδίκῃς* signifies not defence, but revenge. Then for that of Peter, it contains, saith hee, a prohibition of using the sword, but not in case of defence : for hee needed not defend himselfe ; for Christ had said, *Let these goe*, Joh. 18. 8. nor Christ, for hee would not be defended, &c. Besides, saith hee, Peter took up the sword (*in eos qui nomine publicanum potestatem adventabant, quibus an nullo casu resistere liceat, peculiaris est questio, infra à nobis peculiariter tractanda*;) against those that came in the name of the publike powers ; against whom, whether it be lawfull to make resistance in any case, is a peculiar question, to be handled afterward peculiarly. (And, let me pawne my faith for it, stated negatively.) As for that which Christ adds, *All they that take the sword, &c.* that is, either a Proverb, or (which is the opinion of Origen, Theophylact, Tisius, and Euthymius.) indicat, it shewes or intimates, that wee should not snatch revenge out of Gods hands : and to this applies the place in the Revel. a place in Tertull. *Ad id idoneus patientia sequester Deus, &c.* and adds, *Simulque his Christi verbis vaticinium videtur inesse de pœnis, quas à sanguinariis Judæis erat exacturus gladius Romanus* : And also in the words there seemes to be included a Prophecy of the punishment, that the Romane sword should exact of the bloody Jewes. From all which put together, this will be the utmost that Master Marshall can conclude, That Grotius conceived, that the speech of Christ to Peter prohibited not all use of the sword, for private defence ; (no man saith it did ; or that all such defence is unlawfull ; our case is onely of resisting Magistrates) that Origen, Theophylact, &c. owned an exposition of it, that thereby wee should be taught, not to take Gods office of revenging out of his hand ; (which wee also make a speciall part of the importance of that speech, both there, and in the Revel. and so a plaine check of Peter, who did take it ;) and that withall in these words a Prophecy seems to be implied, of the revenge of Christs death, wrought by Tisius upon the Jewes ; (and wee can acknowledge the Scripture so rich a mine of variety, that it may have this propheticke sense also : though by the way, Grotius cites not this out of those foure Writers, (nor could hee, for in Origen we find it not) but as from himselfe, *simulque vaticinium videtur inesse, &c.*

But for the literall sense, that *Peter* should not be rebuked by *Christ*, for using defensive Armes against the Magistrate, (when with the use of those, the leaving vengeance to God is utterly unreconcilable) and Christians conceive themselves bound not to use those Armes against the Magistrate, for this very cause, because hee is *ἀνομίδευος*, *punishable, revengeable by God alone*:) and yet be rebuked for snatching Gods work out of his hand : Or that these words should not belong in the prime sense to *Peters* fact, as well as in a secondary propheticall seeming one to the Jewes, there is not any appearances of sound of any word in *Grotius* there, or in any other place in that book, or his large Annotations on the Gospels : which if Master *Marshall* had read with his own eyes, hee would confesse with me. And so much for his citation of *Grotius*.

Now, in the last place, for the opinion of this learned man *Grotius*, (an excellent Casuist, exactly distinguishing the severall obligations of Nature, of *Moses*, and of *Christ* ; a Protestant, and, if an Arminian, farre from deserving that part of the censure which Master *Cheynel* layes on such, of being as lawlesse as that faction at *Munster*, whose law it was, *Magistratibus ac Principibus nullus subijciatur*) in the businesse of taking up Armes against a King for just defence, I shall referre you to his first Book *de jure belli, & cap. 4.* (Not that I can hope you will be moved with his authority, when hee appeares against you, that is not the manner of men now-a-dayes, to be content to be tried by your owne witnesses ; but for the satisfaction to conscience, which this Authours reasons and perspicuity will yeeld any Christian Reader) the very place whereto hee referd the Reader even now for his resolution in that point ; and the state of this question being set (*An aut privatis aut publicis personis bellum gerere liceat in eos, quorum imperio subsumunt*;) Whether any private or publike persons may lawfully wage warre against them, under whose command they are ; hee defines, that by the very Law of Nature (so much now talkt of) tis not lawfull. 2. That by the Law of the Jewes it was not allowed. 3. That it was lesse allowed, but become more unlawfull by the Evangelicall Law, *Rom. 13. 1. & 1 Pet. 2. 12, &c.* and practice of ancient Christians. 4. Confutes the opinion of those that affirme it lawfull, for inferiour Magistrates to wage warre against the Supreme, by reasons and Scriptures. 5. Proposes the case of extreme and inevitable necessity, when the King goes to take away a mans life unjustly : and (whatsoever might from nature or practice of the Jewes, as of *David*, or of the *Macchabees*, be brought to asserit resistance in this case) hee defines from the Christian Law, (which commands so oft to take up the Crosse) an exacter degree of patience ; and particularly, when for Religion our Superiours goe about to kill us, though hee will allow flight to some sort of men, yet to no man more then flight ; but rather rejoycing when wee suffer as Christians. This, saith hee, was the course that brought Christian Religion to such an height in the world : and resolves it the greatest injury that can be

be done to the ancient Christians, to say, that it was want of strength, not of inclinations that way, that they defended not themselves in time of most certaine danger of death. *Tertullian*, saith hee, had been imprudent and impudent, if in a writing presented to the Emperours (who could not be ignorant of the truth) hee had dared to lye so confidently, when hee saith, *Non desset nobis vis numerorum, &c.* most admirable passages out of ancient Writers hee there cites, for a lease together to the same purpose, of dying for the truth of Religion; and never defending themselves by Arms, against the illegall will of the lawfull Magistrates. (I beseech Master *Marshall* to send to the shop and read the passages, and consider how farre hee hath departed from the Primitivenesse, and Christianity of those examples.) And to conclude, Though *Grotius* (according to his manner, which is to say all that can be wisht in any subject) mentions some cases wherein a King may be resisted, yet if you read them, you will find little joy in any of them: As in case a King shall abdicate his Kingdome, and manifestly relinquish his Power, then hee turnes private man, and so may be dealt with as any other such. And some other the like.

Well, I have said enough of *Grotius* in the businesse, and should adde no more; but, I remember, I promised to shew that on occasion of these words of Christ to Saint *Peter*, hee hath as much against the Exposition pretended to be his, and the whole doctrine of resistance, as the Kings friends could desire; and that is in his Annotations on the place, *Mat. 26. 52. 'Οὐ λα-* In Luk.
βόντες μαχαίρας, &c. *Neque vero ad Petrum tantum admonitio ista perti-* P. 464.
net, sed & ad Christianos omnes, qui à publicis potestatibus ad pœnam ex-
petuntur ob pietatis professionem: The admonition belongs not to *Peter* onely, but to all Christians, when they are called by the Magistrate to suffer for the profession of piety: and sets the rule in that case, *παρὰ τὸς τοὺς ἰσχυρὰς & κρίνει*, to commit our soules to God, to expend our lives in his cause that gave us them; alledging to this purpose, what this *Peter* had learned from this Master, *1 Pet. 4. 16, 19.* and answering the common frivolous objection, fetch from the law of naturall defence, or selfe-preservation, shewing the difference between the use of that liberty against thieves, &c. (against which the Lawes and Magistrates give us the liberty) and against the commands of the Supreme Magistrate; whom if in any case of injury, &c. private men may have permission to resist, or repell force with force, *omnia erunt tumultuum plena; nulla legum, nulla judiciorum auctoritas:* the perfect inage of our Kingdom at this time, when the words are Englished, as God knowes the sense is: and then hee concludes with the case of Religion, wherein there is no place of resisting the higher powers, be their violence never so unjust.

I have undoubtedly made good my foure under-takings in this businesse; and shall beseech Master *Marshall* hereafter to write more cautiously, lest hee provoke men to put him and the world in mind of other unjustifiable

passages in his writings; to tell him of (that which in meere charity to him I desire hee should know men doe take notice of) his dealing in a Sermon of his, about *Josiah's* reformation, preacht before the House of Commons long since: and of the applying of the curse that fell on the Inhabitants of *Merou, Judg. 5.* (for not helping their Sovereigne, namely *Deborah*, against a torraigne Enemy, *Jabin*) to those that will not joyne with himselfe against his Sovereigne, and his Cavaliers; i. e. those Forces raised by him. I wish heartily that Master *Marshall*, having gotten so much authority as to be the *Augustine*, the truly polemical Divine of our times, would be so charitable to his disciples, as to imitate him, in retracting so many of his misadventures, as hee cannot chuse but know to be such; and not to impose too intolerably on their credulity: or so tender of his owne reputation, as to acknowledge those himselfe, which every man that hath eyes doth discern in his books; and would, were it not for meere pity, and the duty of loving enemies, give a large account of.

But I must remember, that Master *Marshall* adds two appearances of answer more to that allegation from Christ to Saint *Peter*; a word or two of those. Secondly, saith hee, *supposing it was a reproofe of Peters using the sword, then the plaine meaning is to condemne Peters rashnesse, who drew his sword, and never said to know his Masters mind whether hee should strike or not; and so reproves those who rashly, unlawfully, or doubtingly use the sword.* But, I pray Sir, are those the words of Christ, *They onely that take the sword without asking, or knowing my mind, shall perish, &c.* Or have we any reason to think, that Christ would have then dispensed with a known law if hee had answered him, and not rather have referred him to be regulated by it, as you see hee doth, *for all that take, &c.*

2. To see the unluckinesse of it againe, the text *Luk. 22. 49.* saith expressly, that they did ask him, said unto him, *Lord, shall wee smite with the sword?* so that the question was aske before hee sinote: And sure, if it had been Christs pleasure they should smite, one syllable would have exprest it, and justified them; and that might have intervened before his striking: and that it did not intervene, is no argument of the lawfulness of that striking in him, or the like in us; especially when so sharp a reprehension immediately follows.

3. I shall grant the meaning is to condemne *Peter's rashnesse*, in doing a thing so unlawfull, without any commission; especially, when it was denied by Christ upon asking; but not that the matter of the fact was perfectly justifiable, if abstracted from that rashnesse: or that now Christs judgement being declared by his answer to him, it should be more justifiable in us, who have his example for our document.

4. I shall aske Master *Marshall*, whether hee hath asked and received knowledge of his Masters mind or no? hee must not meane any of his great earthly Masters, (that joyne with him in the warre against the Supreme; for

for sure, if such tell us wee may, or be so minded, that doth not prove that 'tis lawfull; for then I must aske them what Master they asked? and so, if they have none, conclude them in the number of the *rash* smiters;) but Christ, (for sure hee was *Peter's* Master) or some taught by him in his word, who may give him assurance of the mind of Christ: and if this be produc'd wee will be his disciples also. For, for his Supreme Master on earth, the meer-humane Christ, the Lords anoynted, I beleieve hee means not that hee should be asked, whether hee may be, and should be resisted? and as little reason is there for us to be satisfied by being told by any others inferiour to him, (especially by the chiefe resisters) that wee may lawfully resist.

3. Master *Marshall* adds a consideration, that *now was the houre come of Christs suffering, and not of his Apostles fighting, wherein Christ would not be rescued, no not by twelve legions of Angels, much lesse then by the sword of man: therefore hee saith to Peter, Put up, &c. but intended not, that it should alwayes be unlawfull for his people to use the sword in their just defence against unjust violence; for then hee would never have commanded them but a little before, that hee that hath two coats, let him sell one and buy a sword. To this I answer, 1. That Christ might suffer, though Peter did resist; as wee know hee did; and consequently, the houre of his suffering being come, could not make it in him a crime to resist, if otherwise it were not: It might make Christ refuse the help of his sword, but not produce the text proper to man-slayers against him, unlesse the fact in it selfe were of that nature. 2. This patient manner of Christs suffering, and prohibiting resistance in his just defence, though it were then peculiar, and by decree necessary to Christ; yet is it since become matter of example, and necessary imitation to us, by force of that observation past upon it by Saint *Peter*, and entred into the Canon of our Scripture, 1 *Pet.* 2. 21. *Christ suffered for us, leaving us an example that wee should follow his steps, &c.* And this used as an argument to enforce on us that duty, *vers.* 18. of being subject not onely to good and gentle, but also to froward Masters. So that now, thirdly, though that checke had been peculiar to Saint *Peter's* act, clothed with those circumstances, of being done when 'twas Christs houre of suffering; yet it will be obliging to us also, who are hereunto called, *vers.* 21. to suffer as patiently as Christ did. But then fourthly, wee conclude not from any or all of this, that it should be alwayes unlawfull for Christians to use the sword in their just defence: nor indeed, that it was unlawfull then; Kings may and might subdue by the sword their rebellious Subjects: and private men might defend themselves from private invaders, and besides the proverbiall meaning of that speech (*of selling a coat and buying a sword*; whereby, say the fathers, hee foretold them the dangers impendent over their heads, *οτι ην οπισθεν αυτου (απαγ)* *Chrys.* and advised them to provide for their owne security) I shall not doubt to acknowledge*

that this liberty of private defensive resistance is authorized by that same Scripture : But the resisting of the Magistrate by the Subject, is the thing that from Christs words to *Peter* wee undertake to shew unlawfull, and not any other resistance ; and that the swords were appointed by Christ to be bought to that purpose, is not attempted to be proved by Master *Marshall* ; and to suppose it without prooffe, is to affirme, that no man could invade, or be fit to be killed, but Magistrates. The truth is, here is some art used, either by Master *Marshall*, or some other Artificer (interest, prejudice, or the like) by Master *Marshall* to deceive the Reader ; or by that other to deceive the Composer, by using the phrase of just defence against unjust violence, (which every man grants lawfull among private men) and concluding that not to be made unlawfull by this text, (which we doe not affirm,) whereas all the dispute is, of resisting (not simply any man, but peculiarly) the Magistrate (and those that come with authority from him,) which wee doe affirme to be the very thing exemplified and rebuked in this Text, and so still stands (by that reprehension of Christ) forbidden to us, in despite of Master *Marshall's* evasions.

'T will be now matter of wonder to any, that all this paper should be spent in defence of this one Argument, so briefly confuted and dispatcht by Master *Marshall* ; but I shall answer that wonder too : First, that at the entering on this examination of those few, the necessity of this length of words was not fore-seen. Secondly, that though the escaping the force of this place would not be matter of triumph to Master *Marshall*, because there be other places of the New Testament produced by his adversaries, yet unanswered, and one is enough to establish a Christian truth ; yet the vindicating and clearing of this one from all exceptions, is the absolute carrying the cause against him by that one : And therefore if this may be compassed, (which I am confident is by this discourse) wee may spare all further travell in this businesse ; and command the Subjects sword taken out (though upon supposition of just defence, how unjustly soever that be pretended) against the lawfull Magistrate, to returne to its sheath againe. I wish to God it would obey the command.

Tu vero discipuli & amorem pium & humilitatem considera : alterum enim ex diligendi fervore ; alterum ex obedientia fecerat. Nam cum audisset, Mitte gladium tuum in vaginam, statim obtemperavit, & nusquam postea istud fecit. Titus Bostr. in Matth.

Non se sed magistrum est ultus, praterea nondum perfecta & consummata virtus erat. Quod si vis Petri sapientiam intelligere, videbis postea caesus & sexcentis injuriis passum, nullis malis, nullis calamitatibus perturbatum, sed mansuere omnia tolerantem. Euthym. in Johan.

Ille nititur gladio, qui nullâ superiori ac legitimâ potestate vel iubente vel concedente, in sanguinem alicujus armatur. Nam utique Dominus jusserrat, ut ferrum discipuli ejus ferrent, sed non jusserrat ut ferirent. Quod ergo incongruum, si Petrus post hoc peccatum factus est pastor Ecclesie: sicut Moyses post percussum Egyptium factus est rector istius Synagoga? uterque enim non detestabili immanitate, sed emendabili animositate justitia regulam excessit, uterque odio improbitatis aliena; sed ille fraterno, iste Dominico, licet adhuc carnali, tamen amore peccavit. Aug. lib. 22. cont. Faust. Man. cap. 70.

FINIS.
